 in either the House or the Senate since the Democrats took control of Congress in January. And it would mark a new phase in the political struggle over the conflict.

Pelosi is trying to balance demands from anti-war liberal Democrats for dramatic moves to scale down -- or end -- the war against calls from more moderate and conservative Democrats to avoid votes that would undoubtedly jeopardize their own political futures. That includes a vote on a proposal by Rep. Jack P. Murtha (D-Pa.) to restrict the Pentagon in deploying the additional 21,500 combat troops that President Bush plans to send to Iraq.

At the same time, Republican leaders are railing against Democrats, accusing them of undermining the U.S. military campaign.

For Pelosi, it represents the most difficult challenge of her short, historic speakership, just entering its third month. And the division within her caucus reflects the larger split within the country over the war.

House Majority Leader Steny H. Hoyer (D-Md.) told reporters on Tuesday that top Democrats "are trying to create a consensus" within their own party before bringing the wartime funding bill up for a floor vote.

The bill, however, will not be on the floor until next week at the earliest, he predicted.

"We're discussing whether or not members will feel the necessity to offer such an amendment," Hoyer added.

During a closed-door meeting of House Democrats, Democratic Caucus Chairman Rahm Emanuel of Illinois made "an impassioned plea" for unity on the war, said Democrats who attended the session.

"People have to remember that you can't put it all in one bill," noted a Democratic leadership aide. "This one bill is not going to end the war and solve all our problems."

But Emanuel's appeal, as well as the lobbying by Pelosi and other party leaders, has yet to win over the anti-war Democrats, led by Reps. Barbara Lee and Maxine Waters, both of California.

"We have made no deals with anyone about anything," Waters said.

These Democrats opposed the war since its start and, despite the new Democratic majority in the House, are not at all eager to vote for the new war funds. Supporting the money, they argue, would give them "ownership" of the war along with Bush and the Republicans in Congress.

"I have instructions from my constituents to get us out of Iraq now,'' said Rep. Diane E. Watson, (D-Calif.). "I have the Hollywood community…Not a day goes by that I'm not contacted to get out of Iraq now."

And she said she couldn't support any the additional wartime money, if it isn't coupled with a withdrawal timetable.

A "span of time'' for withdrawing might be amenable, she said. "But it has to be while President Bush is in office. This is his war. He is responsible for it."

Democratic leaders prefer to "have one vote," said Rep. Peter DeFazio (D-Ore.) "Whether there will be other votes has not yet been determined ... I would like to see an alternative that would set a timeline, but right now I'm hoping to get something meaningful incorporated into the bill."

"Leadership has to say to people that they may not get everything they want," added Rep. Henry A. Waxman (D-Calif.). "It's sensitive."

House Republicans, for their part, continue to paint the Democratic maneuvering on the supplemental as an effort to de-fund the war and withdraw troops from Iraq.

DOJ_NMG_0141395

Republican leaders in the House have vowed not to support any wartime spending bill that either limits military commanders' ability to prosecute the war and complete reconstruction projects or becomes a "big green light" for spending unrelated to the war. In general, the more time members spend negotiating the particulars of a spending bill, the more unrelated projects are added as sweeteners for wavering lawmakers.

House Minority Leader John A. Boehner (R-Ohio) said Tuesday that leaders have been reaching out to Republicans to gauge their support for Democratic proposals, even though details had not been released. And he said his members would stand with their leaders when the eventual bill comes to the floor.

But Rep. Wayne Gilchrest (R-Md.), who voted with Democratic leaders to reject Bush's troop surge in a symbolic vote last month, told fellow moderate Republicans that they should consider whatever plan Murtha unveils.

"We really better objectively look at what Murtha is trying to do," Gilchrest said. "It is a conversation we need to have."

The Vietnam veteran said he and other veterans "were craving someone who knew what was going on." And he suggested that Murtha, a former decorated Marine, was the man.

On the other side of the Capitol, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) said he wants to begin a floor debate on Iraq next week, although he has not yet reached an agreement with Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) on what would be debated and for how long.

Sens. Joseph R. Biden Jr. (D-Del.) and Carl Levin (D-Mich.), the chairmen of the Foreign Relations and Armed Services committees, respectively, are drafting a revised version of the 2002 resolution authorizing the U.S. invasion of Iraq, but as with their House counterparts, Senate Democrats have yet to approve that plan. And McConnell is still pushing a proposal by Sen. Judd Gregg (R-N.H.) stating that Congress will not cut funding for U.S. troops in the field.

Patrick O'Connor contributed to this report.

House's Left Wing Threatens War Funds (WT)

By S.a. Miller

The Washington Times, March 7, 2007

Anti-war Democrats in the House said yesterday they would help deny supplemental funding for U.S. forces in Iraq and Afghanistan if the leadership refuses amendments that would limit spending to the current deployment and to a troop withdrawal.

"Some people want out of the war. That's how they got elected, man," said Rep. Lynn Woolsey, California Democrat and co-founder of the 76-member Out of Iraq Caucus. "The supplemental pays for the escalation."

The party's left wing could nix the administration's request for more than $100 billion of added funds for the war -- which Defense Department officials say they need by April to keep fighting -- if it is joined in a "no" vote by Republicans opposed to other restrictions Democrats want on the spending.

"The supplemental could sink," a senior Republican aide said. "House Republicans will oppose any supplemental that cuts funds or tries to attach specific conditions for our troops in harm's way."

Democrats have struggled to appease their anti-war base while not alienating the party's Blue Dogs, who don't want to cut funds for troops in the field.

House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, California Democrat, and other leaders have worked behind the scenes for at least a week to mend fissures in the party.

But war critics say the leadership now has gone too far to give President Bush authority to proceed with plans to send 21,500 more troops to Iraq.

At a caucus meeting yesterday, Democratic leaders angered anti-war members by threatening to block them out of the Iraq debate.

They told the members, according to participants, that no amendments would be accepted on the supplemental appropriations bill, which likely will include measures to make deployments contingent on troops meeting readiness standards and Iraqis meeting benchmarks for self-governance.

"I'm not upset; I'm voting 'no,' " said Rep. Diane Watson, California Democrat and Out of Iraq Caucus member. "I cannot go back to my district and say I gave a waiver to the president to keep troops in Iraq."

House Majority Leader Steny H. Hoyer said he wasn't ready to guarantee a vote on an amendment that would require funds to pay for a troop withdrawal, even if it would bring anti-war representatives onboard.

"We're not talking about guarantees at this point in time," the Maryland Democrat said. "We are discussing whether or not members will feel the necessity to offer such an amendment."

He said the aim of the Iraq debate was to "make policy, not just make points."

Minority Whip Roy Blunt, Missouri Republican, said the back-and-forth among Democrats was delaying consideration of critical funding for troops in combat.

DOJ_NMG_0141396

"House Democrats find themselves in a tough political spot right now, but that hardly gives them license to further delay the delivery of these vital funds for our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan," he said. "There's a reason the supplemental bill is filed under 'emergency spending,' and it's not so that we can sit around and wait for Democrats to think through their political challenges instead of actively engaging the logistical ones."

White House's Tactics Threaten War-Funds Bill (WSJ)

By David Rogers

The Wall Street Journal, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON -- The White House is adopting such a defensive stance on the Iraq-war-funding bill that it risks further alienating the Democrats who will write the measure.

President Bush hosted a Republicans-only strategy dinner in the White House family quarters last week on the war appropriations. At the same time, the administration has resisted giving Democratic staff even technical advice on funding that the new majority wants to add for veterans' health programs.

Rep. Chet Edwards (D., Texas) broke the impasse in the House last week by personally going to a senior health official in the Department of Veterans Affairs. In the Senate, the VA reversed itself only yesterday, hours after the White House budget office was asked if there was an order to resist giving advice.

The skirmishes illustrate the growing partisanship surrounding the war issue. Democrats are plainly torn about approving Mr. Bush's nearly $100 billion request without adding some conditions to try to influence policy. Republicans are threatening to vote against the bill if it is too restrictive on the war effort, even if it means bringing the package down.

House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer (D., Md.) said floor debate on war funding will be delayed until the week of March 19. That dims prospects for Congress to complete action by mid-April as the Pentagon had hoped.

Outright defeat on the House floor -- inconceivable weeks ago -- would be an embarrassment for Democrats. But at a Republican caucus, former Speaker Dennis Hastert (R., Ill.) warned his colleagues they should be prepared with a backup strategy to ensure uninterrupted funding for the war.

In a speech, Mr. Bush said his decision to increase U.S. troop levels in Baghdad was yielding "gradual but important" progress. Still, the administration is making revisions to reflect Vice President Cheney's recent trip to Pakistan and consultations with Army Gen. David Petraeus, the new Iraq commander.

The White House has asked for a total of $99.6 billion for military operations and related foreign aid and State Department functions. Of this, about $3 billion is expected to be redirected to help pay for an estimated $110 million in economic aid for Pakistan and the addition of possibly 4700 soldiers sought by Gen. Petraeus in Iraq.

The administration's initial request provided $5.6 billion to cover the commitment of 21,500 soldiers through Sept. 30. The changes would help pay for support troops as well as an estimated 2,100 soldiers to help Gen. Petraeus guard what are expected to be an increasing number of Iraqi prisoners or detainees apprehended during sweeps of Baghdad neighborhoods.

The White House has consulted with Democrats, including a meeting last week that included Mr. Cheney and Rep. John Murtha (D., Pa.), one of Mr. Bush's critics on the war and a senior member of the House Appropriations Committee. But only four of the most senior Republicans on the House and Senate Appropriations Committees were included at last Wednesday's White House dinner, which included Mr. Cheney and National Security Adviser Stephen Hadley.

"It's so unnecessary," said Sen. Daniel Inouye (D., Hawaii), who will help manage the Iraq bill in the Senate.

Dems To Add Billions To Iraq War Bill (AP)

By Andrew Taylor

AP, March 7, 2007

House Democrats are pushing to add billions of dollars to President Bush's $93.4 billion request for military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, including $900 million for troops suffering from brain injuries and post-traumatic stress disorder.

An additional $2.5 billion would go to strengthen training and readiness for forces not deployed in war zones, and $1.4 billion would go to address housing allowance shortfalls.

At the same time, the Pentagon said Tuesday it needs about $1 billion more to support Bush's decision to send 21,500 additional combat troops to Iraq. It also said it has decided against using the pending supplemental bill to procure combat and cargo aircraft, few if any of which could have been built in time to affect the war.

The $1 billion would support at least 4,000 additional support troops, Deputy Secretary of Defense Gordon England told the House Budget Committee. Up to a total of 7,000 support troops might needed, England said.

The Democratic add-ons for military health care, readiness and mine-resistant vehicles are aimed in part at making the bill more attractive to lawmakers, including Republicans who might be considering voting against the measure over language that

DOJ_NMG_0141397

would curb deployments of troops to Iraq who have had insufficient rest or training or who already had served there for more than a year.

Democrats would permit Bush to get around those restrictions, but only by issuing potentially embarrassing waivers of troop readiness standards.

The Democratic plan would also set benchmarks for the Iraqi government to meet for U.S. troop deployments to continue.

Party factions remain at odds over what restrictions to place on the president. One option discussed among Democrats would be to give anti-war Democrats a vote to cut off war funding altogether — based on the assumption it would be defeated.

But many rank-and-file Democrats don't want to cast such a politically nettlesome vote, leadership aides said.

Reflecting continuing divisions among Democrats over Iraq, the House Appropriations Committee postponed a vote on the measure until next week. House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer, D-Md., also said party leaders are still debating what domestic Democratic priorities to add to the bill, such as farm disaster aid and additional funding for the State Children's Health Insurance Program.

Veterans Committee Chairman Bob Filner, D-Calif., weighed in Tuesday with a request for $5 billion for veterans, while demands also are growing for money to combat bird flu and provide additional heating subsidies.

"It's getting awfully close to the point where it collapses of its own weight," said a Democratic leadership aide, noting that more than $10 billion worth of domestic add-ons had been tentatively approved.

Hoyer acknowledged that "on every (war funding) supplemental you run the risk of a Christmas tree."

House Democrats Say Consensus Is Forming On U.S. Troop Withdrawal (HILL)

By Mike Soraghan

The Hill, March 7, 2007

House Democrats have pushed back consideration of the budget resolution and the Iraq supplemental spending bill because they haven't been able to resolve differences between those who want to mandate a clear date for withdrawal from Iraq and those who don't.

But leaders are still saying they expect a floor vote before the Easter recess begins April 2, and they are stressing that they have reached consensus in some key areas.

"What we're trying to do is make policy, not just points," said House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer (D-Md.).

Hoyer admitted that leaders are "backfilling" their floor agenda with environmental bills because of the delays. Republicans have begun chiding Democrats for stretching out debates to fill floor time with non-controversial bills, such as the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee's dispensing environmental aid to local governments.

"I wonder if we're using the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to extend one day's work into three," Rep. John Mica (R-Fla.) told the Rules Committee as it prepared the bills for the floor. "We're going to spend the week on three bills that should be done in three hours."

Meanwhile, House Democratic Caucus Chairman Rahm Emanuel (D-Ill.) disputed reports that liberal Democratic members will vote against a Democratic plan if it doesn't set a concrete date for withdrawal.

"I don't believe it, and I'll put money on that," Emanuel told The Hill. "Even people who have been quoted saying that have told me, 'That is not my position.'"

Emanuel spoke passionately about a "unity approach" in Tuesday's Democratic Caucus meeting.

"This is the second bill. There is consensus on three important parts," Emanuel said, namely more money for Afghanistan than President Bush had requested, more demands placed on the Iraqi government, and fully training and equipping troops. "That's the building blocks."

About 10 members spoke at the meeting, including Emanuel, House Appropriations Chairman David Obey (D-Wis.), Rep. Alcee Hastings (D-Fla.) and Rep. Barbara Lee (D-Calif.).

Speaking for the liberal wing, Lee said that the "Out of Iraq" caucus is not seeking to cut funding to the troops. But the meeting failed to reach the consensus that leaders are seeking.

Hoyer has said members are discussing a way to allow members of the Progressive and "Out of Iraq" caucuses to offer an amendment on the floor during the Iraq debate for a full withdrawal of troops. But members said that approach was not discussed during Tuesday's caucus meeting.

But one thing is clear. The size of the supplemental spending has grown well past what the administration proposed. Bill writers have begun adding in items such as agricultural disaster aid and money for children's health insurance.

"We're [at] a substantial figure higher than the president's plan," Hastings said, "which causes some heartburn."

Escaping A Painful Past To Find A Shaky Future (WP)

By Brigid Schulte

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

Hussein Hayal al Zaidi says he spent nearly four years in jail in Saddam Hussein's Iraq, once in a 13-by-13-foot cell with 20 other men. His captors blindfolded him and pummeled his eyes, detaching one of his retinas. He has scars on his ankles, feet and hands from where they strung him up with ropes and beat him. His genitalia bear the marks of electric shock burns.

He was sentenced to death in 1999 for participating in an anti-Hussein riot, al Zaidi said. An uncle paid $7,000 to smuggle him out of jail and out of Iraq. He was flown from Syria to Moscow to Cuba to Ecuador before arriving at an airport in Newark, disoriented and ill. He asked for asylum.

An immigration officer in Newark believed his story and let him stay. But an immigration judge in Arlington County, who heard final arguments on his case 10 days after Sept. 11, 2001, did not believe him.

She ordered him deported.

But, like 165 others, the Northern Virginia man cannot be deported. Since the war in Iraq began in 2003, the United States has followed a United Nations directive not to forcibly return Iraqis to their country because it is too dangerous.

Al Zaidi's fate was decided at a time when places such as Anbar province, Nasiriyah and Ramallah had yet to become almost household words. Trial transcripts show that U.S. immigration prosecutors and judges had little idea what a Sunni or a Shiite was or why they would want to kill one another.

Since then, al Zaidi has become part of the largest refugee crisis unfolding in the Middle East in decades, with one in eight Iraqis having fled their homes or the country. In the process, he has become one more story of the fallout of war.

When al Zaidi's appeal of the deportation order was denied in September 2005, immigration officials picked him up at his job at a laundromat and put him in jail, where he stayed until June. He was released, because detainees who can't be deported but pose no threat can't be held for more than six months.

So al Zaidi, 39, lives like a dangling man, in limbo between the hell of his past and fears of a hellish future. In the United States, government officials had suspected he might be an agent of Hussein. In Iraq, he fears that his countrymen, suspicious of his long absence, will think he works for the CIA.

"Of course they're going to kill me," he said in accented English. If not the Shiite militia already asking about him, then the Sunnis or Hussein loyalists. "But I am already dead."

Before he was detained, when he still had hope of staying in the United States, al Zaidi saved money. He thought about buying a house and having a family. He listened to English-language tapes. But now, nothing matters. He started smoking unfiltered Marlboros again. He spends his days watching television, not really paying attention. On a whim, he bought a new car.

"I don't know what I'm doing," he said. "Before, I was careful. But now, for what? Let me enjoy."

Except that he doesn't.

Since his release, he has lived with a friend in a bare townhouse in Vienna, furnished with two white plastic chairs and a TV. The laundromat doesn't want him anymore. Because of his immigration status, the community college he had hoped to attend will not take him. He doesn't eat, except for coffee and nibbles of junk food, such as the packets of Oreos and Mentos strewn on the floor of his room among piles of legal papers. His bed is a sheet on the floor, his pillow a rolled-up winter jacket.

Sometimes, in the middle of the night, he is seized with the notion that he must see the ocean. He goes to Atlantic City. He watches the waves. He doesn't understand what is happening to him.

"It's like I destroy my life."A Setback in a U.S. Court

Some people have believed al Zaidi. A doctor at George Washington University concluded that al Zaidi "did indeed suffer the torture and abuse that he claims." And a psychoanalyst diagnosed him with post-traumatic stress disorder, writing that "he has suffered a process of brutal human degradation."

In February 2001, he told his story on the stand in U.S. immigration court in Arlington. Al Zaidi said he had been drafted into the Army, like all other Iraqi men, and served as a mail clerk during the Iran-Iraq war.

His first arrest, he said through a translator, came in 1991 for participating in an uprising against Hussein after the Persian Gulf War. When his mother tried to bar police officers from their home, they hit her in the head, he said, and killed her.

He said he was arrested in 1996 for having writings of a Shiite cleric in his house. In 1999, he said he was arrested after he and other Shiites shouted anti-Hussein slogans after their leader, cleric Mohammed Sadeq al Sader, was assassinated.

Prosecutors had relatively minor questions about the case. "You still hopeful you can reach agreement in this case?" Judge Joan Churchill asked prosecutors, according to a court transcript -- meaning that they would agree to asylum.

"Yes," the prosecutor answered.

Then, in March, Churchill received an anonymous note that said that while al Zaidi was in Iraq, he was "working as secret service" for Hussein and that he was sent to the United States to kill high-level officials.

DOJ_NMG_0141399

A new prosecutor submitted pages from "Saddam's Bombmaker," a book by Iraqi exile Khidhir Hamza, who claimed to have run Hussein's nuclear weapons program. Hamza wrote that during the Iran-Iraq war, Hussein used Shiite soldiers as human mine detonators. Therefore, prosecutors said, al Zaidi must have had special ties to get a desk job.

Assertions in the book were later questioned by a number of former U.N. weapons inspectors, Iraqi scientists and Iraqi military officers.

The author of the letter, determined to be al Zaidi's roommate in Arlington at the time, Khalid Houmadi, testified that al Zaidi's trip to the United States was financed by Hussein, but he admitted to regularly loaning al Zaidi money.

Churchill sided against al Zaidi. She said she thought his escape through Russia and Cuba was "suspicious," her written decision says. She dismissed the GWU doctor's exam and physical evidence of al Zaidi's torture, saying that it might "be consistent with other causes."

And she said Houmadi "cast considerable doubt upon the credibility of crucial aspects of [al Zaidi's] claim."

Al Zaidi went into a rage. Houmadi was just out to get him, he said. Before writing the letter, Houmadi had threatened to attack a man, and al Zaidi had said that he would report him.

Months later, Houmadi attacked the man. And, as promised, al Zaidi testified against him. Elliot Casey, an assistant commonwealth's attorney in Alexandria, wrote a letter to Churchill, saying that the court found al Zaidi's testimony "completely credible." Houmadi was sentenced to 10 months.

Karla Harr, an attorney for al Zaidi, appealed his case in 2002. It was denied in a one-sentence opinion by one judge, a product of the Department of Justice's new policy of "streamlining" asylum cases. Before, a three-judge panel had reviewed asylum appeals. Under streamlining, the amount of overturned decisions dropped from 25 percent to less than 5 percent, according to studies by the American Bar Association and the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights.

"The complexity of the issues involved in this case demanded a three-panel review, " Harr said.

Al Zaidi was in the process of filing an appeal when he was detained in late 2005. In May 2006, in detention and on a one-month hunger strike, al Zaidi asked for his appeal to be dropped because he thought it would get him out. His attorney assured him that it wouldn't and that he would be released soon because of the rule that says that detainees who pose no threat can't be held for more than six months. But al Zaidi said he had to get out. He dropped his appeal.

"They punish me too much." He was released in June.'I'm Really, Really Tired'

Al Zaidi sat in front of the TV in the spare townhouse. The announcer mentioned Nasiriyah, where he was born. "It's very beautiful there," he said absently.

He is officially under an order of supervision and is waiting for the U.S. government to send him back to Iraq. Once a month, he must check in with his supervisor at the Department of Homeland Security.

He goes to a Panera Bread restaurant where other Arabs and Iraqis hang out. He even sees Houmadi there from time to time. "He apologized to me," al Zaidi said, shrugging.

"I'm really, really tired," he said. And the nightmares come if he tries to sleep. He no longer prays. "It's like I can't find myself."

And so the dangling man with the story that was not believed went out for cigarettes.

NATO Mounts Largest Attack On Taliban In The South (NYT)

By Carlotta Gall

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

KABUL, Afghanistan, March 6 — In its largest offensive since taking command of southern Afghanistan last year, NATO mounted an attack against hundreds of Taliban and foreign insurgents in Helmand Province on Tuesday, military officials said.

NATO said the offensive was aimed at countering the Taliban insurgency, which has joined forces with drug traffickers to make Helmand the most lawless province in Afghanistan. Some 4,500 NATO troops are taking part in the operation, including an American airborne force, as well as 1,000 Afghans.

Four NATO soldiers have been killed in the past eight days, at least two of whom died as troops began moving into northern Helmand Province ahead of the operation, said Col. Tom Collins, a NATO spokesman in Kabul.

Heavy fighting has also raged for the past few days in the town of Sangin, one of the main opium trading centers in northern Helmand Province and on the road to the Kajaki dam, an important United States aid project. Residents have reported that up to 1,000 Taliban were in the town trading artillery and rocket fire with British troops, forcing residents and shopkeepers to flee.

Two British soldiers were killed in a rocket attack in the Sangin area on Sunday, and another NATO soldier was killed Tuesday during combat operations in southern Afghanistan.

DOJ_NMG_0141400

"We know there are hundreds of foreign fighters" in southern Afghanistan, Colonel Collins said. "They are from Central Asia, the Middle East and Africa." He said hard-core Taliban, who number in the "high hundreds," are able to recruit young men in the districts and are supported by militias trafficking in narcotics.

Asadullah Wafa, the governor of Helmand, warned Tuesday that 700 foreign fighters had infiltrated his province in recent weeks from Waziristan, in Pakistan, under the leadership of the Pakistani Taliban commander Abdullah Mehsud, the independent television channel Tolo TV reported.

Waziristan, in Pakistan's tribal areas, has since 2001 become a base for Taliban and foreign fighters who have been accused of training and sending insurgents and suicide bombers into Afghanistan.

"There are areas where they have very significant enemy activity," Colonel Collins said of Helmand Province. "We know this will not be easy, but we are dedicated to this mission and we will not fail."

Troops from Britain — which has command in Helmand — Canada, the Netherlands and the United States, with a mobile airborne force of 1,500 soldiers from the 82nd Airborne Infantry Division, are taking part in the operation.

The 82nd Airborne force was "highly mobile, highly capable" and would provide an extra capability that American and NATO troops lacked last year, Colonel Collins said. Last spring, United States troops mounted an operation into the same area to clear the way for NATO, but NATO forces quickly lost the initiative and were besieged in several northern towns.

The departing commander of NATO forces, Gen. David Richards, said last month that NATO operations would concentrate on gaining control of Helmand Province.

Another aim of the current offensive is to open Helmand to reconstruction and development plans, Gen. Ton van Loon, the NATO commander in southern Afghanistan, said Tuesday at a news conference at the Kandahar air base.

"The operation will improve security and set the conditions for meaningful reconstruction that fundamentally improves the quality of life for all Afghans living in these areas," he said.

The biggest development project in the area is a multimillion-dollar United States government plan to repair and expand the Kajaki dam, which supplies electricity and irrigation to much of the southern region. Progress has been delayed because Taliban attacks have prevented engineers from working there or transporting equipment to the dam.

Afghans Caught In War's Rising Tide (CSM)

By Mark Sappenfield

The Christian Science Monitor, March 7, 2007

.

Along Afghanistan's long southern frontier, the guns of spring have begun. For months, the Taliban has warned that when the highland snows melt, they will unleash their largest offensive since falling from power in 2001.

In recent weeks, the tempo of Taliban attacks has increased, hinting at the opening of the spring campaign. Last weekend alone, insurgents detonated a bomb in the western city of Herat and performed what US officials called a "complex ambush" near the eastern city of Jalalabad.

Tuesday, NATO responded in kind, launching Operation Achilles, its largest offensive ever in the country, at the Afghan government's request. With some 4,500 NATO troops and 1,000 Afghan soldiers, the operation is a bold attempt to preempt the Taliban's first blows and take the initiative.

It is also a clear escalation of the stakes, with both sides seeing this as a year that could determine the future of Afghanistan's Western-backed government. And it is here in the Afghan south that the hammer blow is expected to fall hardest.

Operation Achilles is focused on the southern province of Helmand, where NATO troops are attempting to clear Taliban from the area around the Kajaki Dam so that it can be upgraded and repaired. When fully operational, the dam can provide power for some 2 million Afghans in the south.

Moreover, Helmand has emerged as the Taliban's leading front in recent months. The Taliban claim that they control three rural districts in the province, including Musa Qala, which was the subject of a controversial peace deal between British forces and insurgents before the Taliban captured it on Feb. 1.

Tuesday, the Taliban in Helmand said that they captured an Italian journalist who confessed to spying for British forces, according to a Taliban spokesman. The Italian newspaper La Repubblica says it lost contact with reporter Daniele Mastrogiacomo Sunday.

In many respects, the developments in Helmand are an echo of what happened last year in neighboring Kandahar Province, which, as the home of leader Mullah Omar, has long been the Taliban's heartland. In the past few years, Kandahar has suffered 73 suicide bombings, by one local newspaper's count, and last summer, the Taliban pushed to within 10 miles of the city.

DOJ_NMG_0141401

Now, on the eve of what could be a crucial spring, Afghanistan's second-largest city, less than 50 miles from the front lines, is in a state of suspension, uncertain whether to remain faithful to the government that initially promised so much or to resign itself to the return of the Taliban.

"If I shave my beard and take off my turban, I will be killed by the Taliban. If I grow my beard, I will be killed by [NATO forces]," says Kandahar resident Dost Mohammed, standing on a street corner. "It is a place with two governments – we don't know who we should surrender to."

Like most Afghans both here and elsewhere, Mr. Mohammed speaks not from fear but from an oppressive fatigue born of the mounting sense that his country is once again descending into the cycle of revolution and civil war that has consumed it for a generation. Along with a lingering hope, there remains a deep fatalism that no matter what Afghans do, they will be swept into the whirlwind of war – ever the victims of forces beyond their control.

Caught in the middle

The events of recent weeks have helped strengthen this perception.

On one side, Afghans see the Taliban, which they almost universally consider a Pakistani-equipped army designed to destabilize Afghanistan and who spawn suicide bombers so despicable that they will target the opening of an Afghan medical clinic, as was the case in Khost late last month.

On the other, Afghans see foreign forces who, according to common perception here, usurp the authority of local elders, happily let their male soldiers search Afghan women, and are inclined to shoot first and ask questions later.

In the space of 24 hours last weekend, US forces bombed a family home in a village 50 miles north of Kabul killing nine and engaged in a firefight near Jalalabad that left 10 Afghan civilians dead. In both cases, US forces say that they were attacked first and that insurgents sought to create civilian casualties in the chaos.

But the incident outside Jalalabad in particular has focused on what is perceived as a disproportionate and incautious response by NATO forces to the initial threat from the Taliban, leading Afghan President Hamid Karzai to call for an investigation.

Western forces deny these characterizations. "We are here to protect the people of Afghanistan," says Lt. Col. Angela Billings, a spokeswoman for the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), NATO's force in Afghanistan.

Operation Achilles is an example of this, ISAF officers say. "It signifies the beginning of a planned offensive to bring security to northern Helmand and set the conditions for meaningful development that will fundamentally improve the quality of life for Afghans in the area," Maj. Gen. Ton van Loon, commander of ISAF's southern forces, said in a statement.

Last year, similar military sweeps, such as Operation Medusa, had a significant effect. When the Taliban seized large swaths of territory and tried to hold onto them, the militants sustained heavy losses. But the Taliban's strategic advantage lies in their ability to sow confusion and draw Western forces into attacks that cause civilian deaths.

This year, the Taliban may be more inclined to harry and harass, experts say, stretching NATO as thin as possible by kindling dozens of flash points across the country simultaneously.

"You're not going to see a mass attack – you're going to see a more spread-out offensive," says Ahmed Rashid, author of "Taliban." "They would like to see more crises in European capitals and countries being forced to pull out" of the ISAF alliance.

This has already happened in Italy, where questions of the country's commitment to Afghanistan almost toppled the prime minister recently.

But it also has a clear impact here, where some Afghans protested the deaths in Jalalabad not only with chants of "Death to America!" but also "Death to Karzai!"

Indeed, on the streets of Kandahar, some see the local Canadian ISAF contingent as a greater menace than the Taliban.

Among a clutch of rickshaw drivers assembled by a dusty curbside recently, one says that the Canadians shot his nephew; and another claims that they shot two of his cousins, who were only riding their bicycles.

It was not possible for The Monitor to verify or discredit these claims, but they are indicative of a prejudice among some sections of the population here. "As soon as we see troops on the road, we pull off," says driver Sardar Mohammad, whose weathered face crinkles in lines of grandfatherly concern. "We are afraid of them."

For these men, the concern about the Taliban is something different. No one wants to kneel to perceived Pakistani imperialism. But at least the Taliban are of their same Pashtun stock. They do not fear every bearded face, and they understand the customs of Afghanistan – as well as the importance of Islam.

"There is a reason the fighting is not stopping in Afghanistan: [Foreign troops] don't know our culture," says Dost Mohammad, whose voice seems to be pleading as much as condemning. "They come with their boots into our mosques. This is why everyone is fighting against them."

Nearby, the corpulent figure of Neda Mohammad stands amid the crowd, his hands folded regally, his large frame cloaked in many folds of fine brown fabric. He is from the neighboring province of Oruzgan, but he says that he fled here because Western jets bombed his village. "If there is less persecution on us, then we would prefer the Taliban," he says matter-of-factly.

DOJ_NMG_0141402

'If I don't do it, who will?'

Alima, however, would not.

She ghosts through the muddy back-alleys of Kandahar, the fringes of her silvery-blue burqa fluttering behind. To some, her job of walking door-to-door to give children a free polio vaccination would be seen as humane. But even now, it is enough to get her killed here.

Not only is she a woman doing work – something forbidden in the most conservative interpretations of Islam – but zealous mullahs have also claimed that the immunization program is part of a covert campaign by foreign powers to sterilize Muslims.

If the Taliban were to come back, things would only get worse. "Of course I am scared of the work I am doing during the day – I have nightmares," she says, offering only her first name. "I am afraid that someone will come and shoot me in the head."

But she attempts to steady herself. She needs work to feed her family and buy them clothes, and she wants to serve her people. "If I don't do it, who will?"

To be sure, the potential return of the Taliban offers a far different prospect for the women of Kandahar than it does for the men. "See, I am working!" says Zahra Suliemani, another volunteer in the vaccination campaign, whose bony hands sway beneath her back veil, gripping her medicine box tightly. "I can go out and work as much as a man can work."

"No one wants the Taliban to come back," she says firmly.

But here, amid the ebb and flow of war, lives are already changing. Among the crumbling earthen houses and green spinach fields of her neighborhood, 9-year-old Nazeka chases her friends down dirt paths, shrieking with delight. But when she walks to school, her shoulders cautiously brush the walls by the side of the road. She tries to stay as far from the road – and the car bombs – as possible.

Sometimes, when she has to cross the road, she will ask a Canadian soldier to help her. Sometimes, she says, they do.

"I am afraid of the Taliban, because they are the ones making explosives," says Nazeka. "And I am afraid of the foreign soldiers because wherever they go, there are explosions."

At 9, Nazeka has already seen enough suffering. Unconsciously, she grasps a friend's hand as she explains, in an unwavering voice, how one night in the past "some people took my grandfather and tore him in pieces and then brought him back."

She does not know who did it or why they did it. Nor does she seem to care. "People should be so happy in this country," she says, smiling. "I do not like this war."

Along the city's main thoroughfare, however, those old enough to have seen many such wars merely shrug.

Abdul Bashir, for one, does not seem to be an overly worried sort of person. With a roguish grin, he somewhat curiously attributes his good business this month to the successful lettuce crop.

This from a man who sells used boom-boxes, stacked to the ceiling of his small stall. He polishes one, attempting to make it look presentable amid the dust, while recounting 30 years of violence – from the "holy war" against the Soviets to four years of civil war to the rise and fall of the Taliban.

"The security situation is a concern," he says, the sparkle in his eyes undimmed. "But we're used to it."

NATO Targets Taliban In Afghanistan (USAT)

USA Today, March 7, 2007

NATO-led troops launched their biggest offensive yet in Afghanistan, targeting militants in Helmand province, the military said Tuesday. Operation Achilles involves 4,500 NATO troops and 1,000 Afghan soldiers in an area where hundreds of Taliban insurgents from Asia, the Middle East and North Africa have massed, U.S. Army Col. Tom Collins said.

The militants overran Musa Qala, in the northern part of the province, on Feb. 1 after defying a peace deal between the government and tribal elders reached last fall. The Taliban still controls the town.

Jetliner catches fire while landing in Indonesia

A jetliner carrying 140 people burst into flames as it landed at an airport on Indonesia's Java island today, killing at least 20 people, officials said. Bambang Sugito, general manager of the airport, told el-Shinta radio that 20 bodies had been pulled from the wreckage.

Garuda Indonesia airline said 140 passengers and crew were on board. Ari Sapari, operations director of Garuda, said some passengers escaped and authorities were trying to rescue others. The Boeing 737-400 also was carrying 10 Australians, including journalists and diplomatic staff, Australian Prime Minister John Howard said.

Medic guilty of desertion for refusing Iraq duty

A U.S. military court in Wuerzburg, Germany, on Tuesday found Army Spc. Agustin Aguayo, 35, guilty of desertion for refusing to return to Iraq. The medic was sentenced to eight months in prison. He also will receive a bad-conduct discharge. Aguayo enlisted in 2002, when military operations in Afghanistan were underway and there was talk of a possible Iraq invasion.

DOJ_NMG_0141403

He served a year as a medic in Iraq in 2004 after the military rejected his request to be a conscientious objector. Aguayo said he enlisted to earn money for his education and never considered he would have to fight.

Afghanistan Operation Targets Insurgents (LAT)

By Shafiqullah Azimi And Laura King,

The Los Angeles Times, March 7, 2007

Four Taliban fighters are reported killed in the initial round of the NATO-led offensive.

KABUL, AFGHANISTAN — NATO forces on Tuesday launched the alliance's largest offensive yet against insurgents in southern Afghanistan, marking the start of what both sides predict will be an intense round of fighting over the spring and summer.

The operation, centered in volatile Helmand province, will eventually involve 4,500 NATO troops and about 1,000 soldiers from the Afghan national army, military spokesmen said. Commanders declined to specify how many troops took part in the initial push, or elaborate on the fighting that had taken place so far.

Four Taliban militants were killed in the initial round of combat, Afghan defense officials reported. A British soldier also died Tuesday in southern Afghanistan, but British defense officials later said the soldier had not been part of the offensive.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization has been vowing for months to root out thousands of Taliban fighters, who together with foreign militants have ensconced themselves in Helmand, the world's largest grower of opium poppies.

Taliban and other militants have for some time been able to move freely in and out of the rugged province, which borders Pakistan. Alliance troops, however, lately have managed to kill several important insurgent figures in pinpoint raids in Helmand, including Mullah Akhtar Mohammed Osmani, slain in an American airstrike in December.

A resurgence

Drug revenues are believed to be funding the resurgence of the Taliban militia, which had been left scattered and demoralized after the Islamist movement was toppled in 2001 by U.S.-led forces. The coalition offensive in part was aimed at disrupting the drug trade, Western military officials said.

Col. Tom Collins, a spokesman for NATO's International Security Assistance Force, said the offensive was centered on "improving security in areas where Taliban extremists, narco-traffickers and foreign terrorists are currently operating." NATO spokesmen said securing the area would pave the way for the resumption of reconstruction projects, which have been largely paralyzed in much of the south by rising rviolence.

Helmand province has proved a particularly difficult venue for the alliance. Last spring, the United States poured nearly 11,000 troops into the province's north, an engagement that ended with a declaration of victory, followed in subsequent months by a steady re-infiltration by militants.

The province is now thought to contain the greatest number of insurgents in Afghanistan.

In early February, Taliban fighters overran the town of Musa Qala, where a British-brokered accord had halted fighting. Many townspeople fled when the insurgents arrived, but those who stayed reported being terrorized by the militants, particularly if they were suspected of having ties to the Afghan government or friendly contacts with NATO forces.

The allied offensive is open-ended, coalition commanders said. American, British, Canadian and Dutch troops were taking part in the fighting.

The U.S. contingent eventually will total about 1,500 troops, spokesmen said, but the number taking part in the offensive's initial phase was not specified.

Until now, British troops have borne the brunt of fighting in Helmand. For months, they have tried to secure a major hydroelectric dam in the district of Kajiki but have been unable to keep insurgents out of the area.

Threat of suicide attacks

Both sides say they are ready to seize the offensive this spring. Taliban commanders have boasted of having thousands of suicide bombers and other fighters at the ready.

NATO, for its part, has vowed to take the fight to insurgent strongholds. "I do not think you would be wrong if you were to characterize it as the start of ISAF's major operations for 2007," Collins told journalists in Kabul, the capital.

Senior Western commanders sought to put the spotlight on the Afghan troops involved in the operation, even though nearly five times as many NATO soldiers will take part. The alliance's southern commander, Maj. Gen. Ton van Loon, said, "We need to make sure the government of Afghanistan, with our support … secures the area."

Afghan defense officials took a decidedly lower-key approach, confirming only that the operation had begun and Afghan troops were involved.

Taliban commanders predicted that the NATO offensive would quickly founder.

DOJ_NMG_0141404

Afghan officials said Monday that nine civilians died in a U.S. airstrike north of Kabul. The strike obliterated a compound where U.S. officials said insurgents who attacked an American firebase had taken shelter.

Afghan officials said a Taliban fighter lived in the compound but had apparently escaped.

Analysts have suggested that insurgents may rely heavily on suicide attacks and roadside bombings rather than seeking a conventional military confrontation with NATO troops.

Bombing, kidnappings

Afghan officials said a policeman was killed Tuesday by a roadside bomb in Helmand province.

Further underscoring the area's lawlessness, an Italian journalist and two Afghan colleagues were reported to have been seized by insurgents in Helmand. The Italian newspaper La Repubblica said on its website that it had lost contact on Sunday with reporter Daniele Mastrogiacomo, who last checked in from neighboring Kandahar province.

A Taliban spokesman had earlier identified the captured Westerner as a British national.

king@latimes.com

Special correspondent Azimi reported from Kabul and Times staff writer King from Istanbul, Turkey.

NATO Offensive Targets Taliban In S. Afghanistan (WP)

By Griff Witte

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

ISLAMABAD, Pakistan, March 6 -- NATO and Afghan forces on Tuesday launched what commanders described as a major operation in a key province of southern Afghanistan, part of a bid to win back territory that has become a haven for insurgents.

The operation, the international force's largest to date in the country, was centered in the northern part of Helmand province, where Afghan government authorities have little control and insurgents move with relative impunity. The province's governor said Tuesday that 700 al-Qaeda fighters had moved into the region, and were believed to be planning more of the suicide bombings and other attacks that have besieged Afghanistan for the past year and a half.

Both sides have said this is likely to be a bloody spring, and Tuesday's operation seemed to mark a significant escalation. NATO forces said that they began the operation at 5 a.m. and that it would ultimately involve 4,500 NATO troops from several nations, including the United States, Britain, Canada and the Netherlands, plus 1,000 Afghan soldiers.

More than 1,000 U.S. troops from the 82nd Airborne Division were part of the offensive, which was dubbed Operation Achilles. The United States has 27,000 troops in Afghanistan, 15,000 of whom are under NATO command.

The U.S. airborne unit had only recently moved into southern Afghanistan and was able to slip into position in Helmand beginning Monday evening and continuing overnight, according to Col. Tom Collins, a spokesman for NATO forces. "We think we have achieved some tactical surprise by moving into the area in the way that we did," Collins said.

Despite the scale of the operation, NATO forces had not publicly reported any heavy fighting by late Tuesday night, and Afghan officials in Helmand said they had not heard of any major combat. Officials did say that a British soldier had been killed during fighting in Helmand; four suspected insurgents were also reported killed in the south.

It was unclear how the Taliban and other insurgent groups would respond to an offensive. In the past, insurgents have conducted strategic retreats in the face of major operations and waited until the threat died down.

The start of Operation Achilles follows by nine months another operation in the same part of the country that involved 11,000 U.S.-led troops. Since then, insurgents have intensified their hold in northern Helmand. Last month they even took control of one district, Musa Qala, in defiance of a peace deal signed with local elders. Poppy production has also soared in the province, which is Afghanistan's largest producer of opium.

Lt. Col. Angela Billings, a spokeswoman for NATO forces, said the time is right to try to break the insurgents' grip on the area.

"Afghanistan is a different place than it was nine months ago. The local population is tired of the unrest," Billings said. "They're definitely behind [NATO forces] and the Afghan national security forces. They believe in the government, and they want to be supportive."

The immediate goal of the operation was to secure a highway that leads to a dam where international aid organizations are supposed to be working on a hydroelectric project. Instability has kept them out, however, and NATO military officials said the hope is that the operation will allow them to come back. The operation could take weeks, or more.

The governor of Helmand, Asadullah Wafa, indicated at a news conference in Kabul on Tuesday that he welcomed the NATO offensive. Wafa said that over the past year insurgents had driven away Afghan security forces in four districts of his province and that more foreign troops were needed to regain control.

DOJ_NMG_0141405

Wafa said that recently a key insurgent leader had massed 700 fighters in the province. He identified the leader as a Pakistani al-Qaeda member named Abdullah Massoud and said that Massoud's fighters include al-Qaeda members from Pakistan, Chechnya, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan and the Persian Gulf.

"Afghanistan's neighbor, Pakistan, and al-Qaeda want to turn Helmand into a terrorist center," Wafa said.

Afghan authorities have long said Pakistan is enabling the Taliban movement to thrive by giving insurgents a sanctuary in the relatively lawless tribal areas near the two countries' border. Pakistani officials counter that they are doing their best to crack down on Taliban and al-Qaeda activity and are supportive of NATO's mission in Afghanistan.

Also in Afghanistan on Tuesday, members of the Taliban told [a] news agency that they had abducted an Italian newspaper reporter in Helmand and accused him of being a spy for British troops. At the same time, the Italian newspaper La Repubblica said that it had not been able to contact one of its reporters since Sunday and that he had been in the volatile southern province of Kandahar when the paper last heard from him.

NATO Troops Launch Offensive Against Taliban (WT/AP)

By Fisnik Abrashi

The Washington Times, March 7, 2007

KABUL, Afghanistan -- In its largest offensive yet, thousands of NATO troops moved yesterday into the mountains of southern Afghanistan where hundreds of hard-core Taliban insurgents hold sway -- an operation in the world's biggest opium-producing region aimed at winning over a population long supportive of militants.

Comprising 4,500 NATO and 1,000 Afghan troops, Operation Achilles marks the start of NATO's major spring military action, said Col. Tom Collins, spokesman for NATO's International Security Assistance Force.

NATO hopes it can establish security among a population now harboring Taliban militants, foreign fighters and drug traffickers, and rid the region of its shadow Taliban government. That would allow President Hamid Karzai's administration to make its first move into a lawless region overflowing with the poppies funding the Taliban insurgency.

"What you are going to see in the coming weeks is the enemy reacting to the strategic initiative of the government of Afghanistan and the [NATO] forces it's partnered with," Col. Collins said. "It is us moving into [Taliban] areas, not the other way around."

The offensive is NATO's largest ever in the country. But it involves only half the number of troops that fought in a U.S. offensive in the same region just nine months ago, when 11,000 U.S.-led troops attacked fighters in northern Helmand province during Operation Mountain Thrust.

Although 1,500 U.S. troops along with British, Canadian and Dutch soldiers were returning to the region, the situation was "fundamentally different" this year, and NATO had a much better opportunity to establish a permanent presence because more troops were in the country.

The offensive "is focused on improving security in areas where Taliban extremists, narco-traffickers and foreign terrorists are currently operating," Col. Collins said. "Once the security situation is improved, we will begin short- and long-term reconstruction projects."

Officials estimate there are hundreds of hard-core Taliban insurgents in the area, as well as hundreds -- or perhaps thousands -- of foot soldiers hired to fight for the group.

Col. Collins said NATO was working closely with the government to prevent civilian casualties, which have dogged military operations here and resulted in strong protests from Mr. Karzai and other Afghans. Up to 20 civilian deaths in three incidents Sunday and Monday can be attributed to U.S. or NATO military action, Afghan officials and witnesses say.

Afghan defense officials said four Taliban insurgents were killed in the first day of the offensive. Britain's Ministry of Defense said a British soldier was also killed in Helmand, but not as part of the operation.

Helmand is the world's biggest producer of opium, and a new U.N. drug assessment indicates this year's poppy harvest could be higher than last year's record output. The U.N. says Taliban fighters protect poppy farmers and tax the crop, deriving money for their insurgency -- perhaps as much as hundreds of millions of dollars.

Aside from offering protection, the Taliban also derives its strong local support from ethnic and tribal ties.

The government has little control over many parts of northern Helmand, and the British troops stationed there battle almost daily with militants. U.S. intelligence officials say Taliban fighters have flooded into Helmand over the past several months, and there are now more fighters there than anywhere else in the country.

"We cannot allow extremists, criminals and Taliban to decide what happens in this country," Maj. Gen. Ton van Loon, the NATO force's southern commander, told reporters. "We need to make sure the government of Afghanistan with our support ... secures the area."

DOJ_NMG_0141406

British troops have been battling for several weeks with militants in the district of Kajaki -- the thrust of yesterday's operation -- to enable repairs on a hydroelectric dam there, which can supply close to 2 million Afghans with electricity.

Militants also overran Musa Qala, another district in northern Helmand province, on Feb. 1 after defying a peace deal between the government and elders reached last fall. The Taliban still controls the town, and Col. Collins said NATO forces would not move in until the government approves.

Meanwhile, a remote-controlled bomb targeting a police vehicle yesterday killed one policeman and wounded another in Murja district, also in Helmand, said Ghulam Nabi Mulakhail, the province's police chief.

In Rome, the Italian newspaper La Repubblica said it has lost contact with its reporter in Afghanistan, and a spokesman for the Taliban said yesterday the group had captured a person posing as a journalist who previously worked for the paper.

La Repubblica has had no contact with Daniele Mastrogiacomo since Sunday. It was not clear whether the person captured by the Taliban was the missing La Repubblica reporter.

"Taliban higher authorities" will decide what to do with them, Qari Yousef Ahmadi, who claims to speak for the Taliban, told the Associated Press by satellite phone from an undisclosed location. "We are investigating whether they are British spies."

DOJ:

Prosecutors Say They Felt Pressured, Threatened (WP)

By Dan Eggen And Paul Kane, Washington Post Staff Writers

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

Hill Republicans, Justice Dept. Cited

Six fired U.S. attorneys testified on Capitol Hill yesterday that they had separately been the target of complaints, improper telephone calls and thinly veiled threats from a high-ranking Justice Department official or members of Congress, both before and after they were abruptly removed from their jobs.

In back-to-back hearings in the Senate and House, former U.S. attorney David C. Iglesias of New Mexico and five other former prosecutors recounted specific instances in which some said they felt pressured by Republicans on corruption cases and one said a Justice Department official warned him to keep quiet or face retaliation.

Iglesias's allegations of congressional interference have prompted a Senate ethics committee inquiry. Yesterday he offered new details about telephone calls he received in October from Sen. Pete V. Domenici (R-N.M.) and Rep. Heather A. Wilson (R-N.M.), saying he felt "leaned on" and "sickened" by the contacts seeking information about an investigation of a local Democrat.

Another former prosecutor, John McKay of Seattle, alleged for the first time that he received a call from the chief of staff to Rep. Doc Hastings (R-Wash.), asking about an inquiry into vote-fraud charges in the state's hotly contested 2004 gubernatorial election. McKay said he cut the call short.

Ed Cassidy, a former Hastings aide who now works for House Minority Leader John A. Boehner (R-Ohio), said yesterday that the call was routine and did not violate "permissible limits" on contact with federal prosecutors. Hastings, the ranking Republican on the House ethics committee, also said that the exchange was "entirely appropriate."

In remarks after the hearings, McKay said that officials in the White House counsel's office, including then-counsel Harriet E. Miers, asked him to explain why he had "mishandled" the governor's race during an interview for a federal judgeship in September 2006. McKay was informed after his dismissal that he also was not a finalist for the federal bench.

White House spokesman Scott Stanzel declined last night to respond to McKay's comments.

Yesterday's testimony featured new allegations of threatened overt retaliation against the prosecutors, as former U.S. attorney Bud Cummins of Little Rock said a senior Justice Department official warned him on Feb. 20 that the fired prosecutors should remain quiet about their dismissals. Cummins recounted in an e-mail made public yesterday that the official cautioned that administration officials would "pull their gloves off and offer public criticisms to defend their actions more fully."

"It seemed clear that they would see that as a major escalation of the conflict meriting some kind of unspecified form of retaliation," Cummins wrote in the e-mail, which he sent as a cautionary note to fellow prosecutors.

The senior official, Michael J. Elston, chief of staff to Deputy Attorney General Paul J. McNulty, wrote in a letter to the Senate that he never intended to send a threatening message in his talks with Cummins. Justice Department spokesman Brian Roehrkasse said that "a private and collegial conversation" was "being twisted into a perceived threat by former disgruntled employees grandstanding before Congress."

The six U.S. attorneys who appeared yesterday had declined to testify voluntarily. They were subpoenaed by a House Judiciary subcommittee and threatened with subpoenas in the Senate. Their testimony marked the latest twist in the U.S. attorneys saga, which began quietly on Dec. 7 with a spate of firings, but has prompted concern among current and former

DOJ_NMG_0141407

federal prosecutors that the firings -- and the Justice Department's evasive and shifting explanations -- threaten to permanently damage the credibility of U.S. attorney's offices nationwide.

"The whole series of events has been remarkable and unprecedented," said Mary Jo White, who served for nine years as the U.S. attorney for the Southern District of New York during the Clinton and Bush administrations. "It's not a matter of whether they have the power to do it; it's a matter of the wisdom of the actions taken. It shows a total disregard for the institution of the U.S. attorney's offices and what they stand for."

Arlen Specter (Pa.), the ranking Republican on the Senate Judiciary Committee, said during the testimony that "if the allegations are correct, there has been serious misconduct in what has occurred."

The Justice Department said initially that the prosecutors had "performance-related" problems, but more recently it asserted that they had not adequately carried out Bush administration priorities on immigration, the death penalty and other issues. The department has also acknowledged that Cummins, the Little Rock prosecutor, was asked to resign solely to provide a job for a former aide to presidential adviser Karl Rove.

"In hindsight, perhaps this situation could have been handled better," Assistant Attorney General William E. Moschella said in prepared testimony yesterday in the House. " . . . That said, the department stands by the decisions."

Moschella said Justice did not intend to evade Senate oversight of U.S. attorneys, who under a new law can be appointed on an interim basis indefinitely by Attorney General Alberto R. Gonzales.

For the first time, Moschella detailed in public the department's rationale for each of the dismissals (although most of the claims had previously been aired through anonymous comments and documents leaked to reporters). All but one of the fired prosecutors had received positive job evaluations, but Justice officials say those reports do not include all possible performance problems.

Moschella also said it is "dangerous, baseless and irresponsible" to allege that the firings were linked to unhappiness over public corruption probes, as Iglesias and some Democrats have alleged.

In addition to Iglesias, four other fired prosecutors were conducting political corruption investigations of Republicans when they were dismissed. Carol S. Lam of San Diego, for example, oversaw the guilty plea of former Republican representative Randy "Duke" Cunningham, and brought related indictments against a former CIA official and a defense contractor.

Iglesias testified that Wilson called him while he was visiting Washington on Oct. 16 to quiz him about an investigation of a state Democrat related to kickbacks in a courthouse construction project.

"What can you tell me about sealed indictments?" Iglesias said Wilson asked him.

Iglesias said "red flags" immediately went up in his mind because it was unethical for him to talk about an ongoing criminal investigation, particularly on the timing of indictments.

"I was evasive and unresponsive," he said of his conversation with Wilson. She became upset, Iglesias testified, and ended the conversation.

"Well, I guess I'll have to take your word for it," she said, according to Iglesias.

About 10 days later, Iglesias said, Domenici's chief of staff, Steve Bell, called Iglesias at his home in New Mexico and "indicated there were some complaints by constituents." Domenici then got on the phone for a conversation that lasted "one to two minutes," Iglesias recalled.

"Are these going to be filed before November?" Domenici asked, Iglesias testified, referring to the kickback case. Unnerved by the call, Iglesias said he responded that they were not.

"I'm sorry to hear that," Domenici replied, according to Iglesias, who added that the senator then hung up.

"I felt sick afterward," Iglesias said, acknowledging that he did not report the calls to Washington as required under Justice rules. "I felt leaned on. I felt pressured to get these matters moving."

Domenici stressed in a statement issued yesterday that Iglesias "confirmed" that the senator never mentioned the November election and that he had no idea why the prosecutor felt "violated." In a separate statement, Wilson said she was only passing on complaints from unidentified constituents and apologized for any "confusion" about the call.

In the e-mail released yesterday, Cummins wrote that Elston called him after a Feb. 18 Washington Post article, which quoted Cummins as criticizing Justice officials for blaming the firings on performance problems. He said that he defended his remarks, and that he made a point of noting that the prosecutors had declined invitations to testify before Congress.

"He reacted quite a bit to the idea of anyone voluntarily testifying," Cummins wrote, adding later: "I don't want to stir you up . . . or overstate the threatening undercurrent in the call, but the message was clearly there and you should be aware before you speak to the press again if you choose to do that."

Cummins testified that he did not feel threatened by the conversation, but others, including Iglesias and McKay, said they took it as such.

Former U.S. attorneys Daniel Bogden of Las Vegas and Paul Charlton of Phoenix also testified.

DOJ_NMG_0141408

Ex-U.S. Attorney's Email Warns Of Retaliation (WSJ)

By Evan Perez

The Wall Street Journal, March 7, 2007

A top Justice Department official, reacting to public criticism of the department over the firings of eight U.S. attorneys, called one of the ousted prosecutors and said the department may have to "pull their gloves off and offer public criticisms" against the prosecutors if the prosecutors continued to talk publicly about the dismissals, one of the prosecutors said.

Bud Cummins, who was fired last June from his job as U.S. attorney for the Arkansas Eastern District, based in Little Rock, told other dismissed U.S. attorneys in a Feb. 20 email that he thought the call from Mike Elston, an aide to Deputy Attorney General Paul McNulty, was "amiable enough." Mr. Cummins told the former prosecutors that he didn't want to "overstate the threatening undercurrent in the call, but the message was clearly there and you should be aware before you speak to the press again if you choose to do that."

Mr. Cummins's email was made public as several attorneys testified before the House and the Senate. Justice Department officials came under withering fire from lawmakers in both chambers over the recent dismissal of at least eight U.S. attorneys. (Read the email.7)

Mr. Cummins's firing is what started the uproar. His interim replacement, Timothy Griffin, is a former political official in the Bush White House and the Republican National Committee. Mr. Cummins, in an interview, said a top Justice official asked for his resignation in June, saying the White House wanted to give another person the opportunity to serve. Since the controversy arose, Mr. Griffin has announced he doesn't plan to seek Senate confirmation.

The Justice Department said Mr. Elston didn't threaten Mr. Cummins. "We stand by our statement that Mike Elston did not tell any U.S. attorney what they should or should not say publicly about their departure, and any suggestion that such a conversation took place is ridiculous and not based on fact, " Brian Roehrkasse, a Justice Department spokesman said.

Mr. Cummins sent his email to Daniel Bogden, Paul K. Charlton, David Iglesias, Carol Lam and John McKay. Justice Department officials have said the Dec. 7 dismissals were performance-related. The department's performance claims has prompted protests from some of those let go—some of whom have taken to referring to the firings at the "Pearl Harbor Day Massacre." Some of the prosecutors have said they would not have protested the moves otherwise.

Democrats cited the firings as proof that under Attorney General Alberto Gonzales, the Justice Department has devolved into a political arm of the White House, especially in light of statements from Republican Sen. Pete Domenici, of New Mexico, that he sought the removal of Mr. Iglesias, the U.S. attorney in his home state, and called him to inquire about the status of a corruption investigation involving local Democrats.

Prosecutors Describe Contacts From Higher Up (NYT)

By David Johnston

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON, March 6 — Six ousted United States attorneys told Congressional panels Tuesday new details about lawmakers' intrusions in sensitive investigations and possible efforts by the Justice Department to squelch their public protests over their firings.

In testimony at hearings in the Senate and House, the prosecutors spoke of intrigue over their dismissals and their surprise last December that they had been asked to resign but were given no explanation.

Democrats said the testimony raised more questions about the Justice Department's motives for the removal of eight prosecutors. "Federal prosecutors are supposed to be bedrock neutral servants of the law, not temporary tools in the service of some political end," said Senator Charles E. Schumer, Democrat of New York and a member of the Judiciary Committee.

H. E. Cummins III, who was removed last summer as a United States attorney in Arkansas, said that in late February, Michael Elston, chief of staff to the deputy attorney general, Paul J. McNulty, told him by telephone that any prosecutor who spoke to reporters could face retaliation.

In an e-mail message to several dismissed prosecutors that was disclosed at the hearing, Mr. Cummins wrote of senior Justice Department officials, "They feel like they are taking unnecessary flak to avoid trashing each of us specifically or further, but if they feel like any of us intend to continue to offer quotes to the press, or to organize behind the scenes Congressional pressure, then they would feel forced to somehow pull their gloves off."

In a letter on Tuesday addressed to Mr. Schumer, Mr. Elston responded that he was "shocked and baffled" by Mr. Cummins's portrayal of their past discussions.

"I do not understand how anything that I said to him in our last conversation in mid-February could be construed as a threat of any kind," Mr. Elston wrote, "and I certainly had no intention of leaving with that impression. At no time did I try to suggest to him what he or any other former U.S. attorney should or should not say about their resignations."

Under questioning by Senator Arlen Specter, Republican of Pennsylvania, Mr. Cummins said it was possible Mr. Elston had not intended to threaten anyone and had been offering friendly advice.

A Justice Department official acknowledged to the House Judiciary Committee that the dismissals could have been handled better. The official, William E. Moschella, a top aide in the deputy attorney general's office, told the committee: "These U.S. attorneys could have been informed at the time that they were asked to resign about the reasons for the decision. Unfortunately, our failure to provide reasons to these individual U.S. attorneys has only served to fuel wild and inaccurate speculation about our motives, and that is unfortunate because faith and confidence in our justice system is more important than any one individual."

The department said recently that the prosecutors had been fired for performance problems or for failure to carry out department policies. But some Democrats have charged that the dismissals were intended to squelch corruption investigations or replace independent-minded prosecutors.

Much of the testimony on Tuesday focused on what the prosecutors said were disconcerting calls they received in prominent inquiries.

David C. Iglesias, who was removed as the United States attorney in Albuquerque, provided new details about phone calls he received from Senator Pete V. Domenici and Representative Heather A. Wilson, two Republicans from New Mexico.

Mr. Iglesias said he felt "sick" after a phone call from Mr. Domenici and his chief of staff several days before the 2006 elections. He said it was the first time he had received a call at home from Mr. Domenici, whom Mr. Iglesias described as a one-time political mentor.

He said that Mr. Domenici had inquired about a corruption case involving a courthouse construction contract and Democrats in the state. Mr. Domenici asked whether charges were "going to be filed before the election," Mr. Iglesias said.

Mr. Iglesias said he had replied, "I don't think so." In response, he said, Mr. Domenici hung up. "I had a sick feeling in the pit of my stomach that something bad had just happened," Mr. Iglesias said. "I felt leaned on, I felt pressured to get these matters moving."

After the testimony Mr. Domenici said in a statement that he still regarded the call as nonthreatening.

Two weeks earlier, Mr. Iglesias said, he had received a brief phone call from Ms. Wilson, who was locked in a tight race in which the corruption inquiry was a hotly debated topic.

Mr. Iglesias said he was surprised when she asked him about the inquiry and whether there had been sealed indictments filed in the case. When he responded that he could not discuss the subject, he testified, she was "not happy about it" and told him, "I guess I'll have to take your word for it."

Ms. Wilson said Tuesday in a statement that her call had been an effort to alert Mr. Iglesias about rumors that he was intentionally delaying indictments. "I did not ask about the timing of any indictments," she said, "and I did not tell Mr. Iglesias what course of action I thought he should take or pressure him in any way."

Another prosecutor, John McKay of Seattle, said he received a call in late 2004 from Ed Cassidy, a former chief of staff to Representative Doc Hastings, Republican of Washington.

At the time, Mr. McKay was weighing whether to convene a grand jury to investigate accusations of voter fraud in a close election for governor. He said Mr. Cassidy called to inquire about the status of the investigation.

Mr. McKay said he cut off the conversation, telling Mr. Cassidy that he was certain he would not want to ask about confidential prosecution matters. "I was concerned and disconcerted by the call," Mr. McKay said.

In a statement, Mr. Hastings said that the call was appropriate. "It was a simple inquiry and nothing more — and it was the only call to any federal official from my office on this subject either during or after the recount ordeal," he said.

Fired U.S. Attorneys Felt 'Leaned On' (AP)

By Laurie Kellman, Associated Press Writer

AP, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON (AP) - Alleging heavy-handed political pressure, fired U.S. prosecutors testified Tuesday they felt ``leaned on'' by Republican lawmakers to seek indictments and hushed by a Justice Department official who did not want them talking about their dismissals.

Testifying before Democratic-controlled congressional committees, six of eight recently ousted prosecutors said they were fired without explanation. Several described what they said was improper pressure by Republicans on pending cases.

New Mexico's David Iglesias told lawmakers he felt pressed by Sen. Pete Domenici, R-N.M., last October to rush indictments against Democrats before Election Day in November.

Arkansas' Bud Cummins wrote other fired prosecutors in an e-mail last month of a ``message'' conveyed by a Justice Department official that if they continued to talk with news reporters, the agency ``would feel forced to somehow pull their gloves off'' and fight back.

John McKay, the fired U.S. attorney in Seattle, said he stopped a top aide to Rep. Doc Hastings, R-Wash., from asking him detailed questions about an investigation into the disputed election of Washington state's Democratic Gov. Christine Gregoire in 2004.

A Justice Department official, invited to one of the two hearings, denied that any of the eight fired U.S. attorneys was improperly pressured or that they were ousted to make room for Republican political allies. Most of the firings were inspired by performance-related issues, he said.

California's Carol Lam, for example, was let go because her prosecution rate for violent crime and border violations was insufficient, William Moschella, an associate deputy attorney general, told a House subcommittee. Iglesias was fired because he had delegated too much to a deputy.

His accounting conflicts with performance reviews obtained by The Associated Press that give those ousted positive assessments.

``This administration has never removed a United States attorney to retaliate against them. Not once,'' Moschella said. ``The department stands by its decision to ask these U.S. attorneys to resign.''

A White House spokeswoman, Dana Perino, said administration officials were aware of the impending firings and offered no objections. Presidential adviser Karl Rove ``wasn't involved in who was going to be fired or hired.''

A former Rove aide, Tim Griffin, took over in Arkansas on an interim basis in December. Griffin said last month he would not seek Senate confirmation, saying a ``partisan circus'' had formed around his appointment.

The administration's defense took up only a few moments in the daylong parade of fired federal prosecutors across Capitol Hill, where they recounted being kicked out of their jobs, first to the Senate Judiciary Committee and then to the House Judiciary subcommittee on commercial and administrative law.

Their stories spanned states and legal issues, but they insisted they were not fired for poor performance. The department's claim to the contrary, several fired prosecutors said, inspired them to speak publicly.

In perhaps the day's most dramatic testimony, Iglesias told senators he felt sickened when Domenici hung up on him after being told that indictments in a corruption case against Democrats would not be handed down before the November elections.

``He said, 'Are these going to be filed before November?'" Iglesias recalled. ``I said I didn't think so. And to which he replied, 'I'm very sorry to hear that.' And then the line went dead.''

Iglesias said he received the call from Domenici at home on Oct. 26 or 27 and that it lasted two minutes, ``tops.''

``I felt leaned on. I felt pressured to get these matters moving,'' Iglesias testified. Asked by Sen. Chuck Schumer, D-N.Y., whether such a call was unusual in Iglesias' experience, the former prosecutor answered, ``Unprecedented.''

In a statement late Tuesday, Domenici said, ``Neither I nor those who overheard my side of the brief conversation recall my mentioning the November election to him. I did not pressure him.''

Democrats tried to assemble the anecdotes into a pattern of intimidation and obstruction by the Bush administration and two Republican lawmakers.

``For over 150 years the process of appointing interim U.S. attorneys has worked well with virtually no problems,'' said Sen. Dianne Feinstein, D-Calif. ``We need to assure that this kind of politicization of the U.S. attorney's offices does not happen again.''

Democrats contend the administration fired the prosecutors without cause in an effort to make way for and reward GOP allies with the plum appointments - without Senate confirmation.

A Republican joined the criticism to some extent, saying he was not convinced that the department acted properly.

``If the allegations are correct, then there has been serious misconduct in what has occurred in the terminations of these United States attorneys,'' Sen. Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania said.

Domenici and Rep. Heather Wilson, R-N.M., have acknowledged making the calls. They have denied placing political pressure on Iglesias. Neither responded to requests for reaction to Iglesias' testimony.

The two lawmakers may face additional questions over the matter. House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer, D-Md., said the House ethics committee ``has a responsibility'' to investigate Wilson's conduct. A watchdog group, Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington, has called for investigations of both Wilson and Domenici.

In the Arkansas firing, the Senate committee released an e-mail written by Cummins regarding a phone call he says he received Feb. 20 from a department official.

DOJ_NMG_0141411

Mike Elston, chief of staff to Deputy Attorney General Paul McNulty, expressed displeasure that the fired prosecutors had talked to reporters about their dismissals, according to the text.

``If they feel like any of us intend to continue to offer quotes to the press, or organize behind the scenes congressional pressure, then they feel forced to somehow pull their gloves off and offer public criticisms to defend their actions more fully," Cummins said in the e-mail to five other fired prosecutors.

``I don't want to overstate the threatening undercurrent in the call, but the message was clearly there," he added.

Asked by Specter whether he felt he was being threatened, Cummins said, ``Some people would want to interpret that as a threat, but it could also be, 'Hey, here's some friendly advice.'"

The department denied making any threat, implied or otherwise.

``A private and collegial conversation between Mike Elston and Bud Cummins is now somehow being twisted into a perceived threat by former disgruntled employees grandstanding before Congress," department spokesman Brian Roehrkasse said.

``Mike Elston did not tell any U.S. attorney what they should or should not say publicly about their departure and any suggestion that such a conversation took place is ridiculous and not based on fact," Roehrkasse said.

As for the call to McKay by Hastings' aide, the congressman, who is ranking Republican on the House ethics committee, said, ``It was a simple inquiry and nothing more." Ed Cassidy, Hastings' former chief of staff, is now senior adviser to Republican leader John Boehner of Ohio.

Iglesias told the panel he received a call from Wilson in mid-October in which she asked him about sealed indictments - a topic prosecutors cannot discuss. Wilson's question ``raised red flags in my head," Iglesias said.

``I was evasive and nonresponsive to her question," Iglesias told the panel, saying he talked generally about why some indictments are sealed. ``She was not happy with that answer. And she said, 'Well I guess I'll have to take your word for it." The call ended almost immediately, Iglesias said.

Asked by Schumer if he felt pressured by that call, Iglesias replied: ``Yes sir, I did."

Associated Press writers Jennifer Talhelm, Hope Yen and Larry Margasak contributed to this report.

Fired Prosecutor Felt Lawmakers' 'Pressure' (WT)

By Eric Pfeiffer

The Washington Times, March 7, 2007

A former federal prosecutor yesterday told a Senate panel that he was fired after Republican lawmakers called him and voiced concern about the sluggish pace of a corruption probe of New Mexico Democrats last year.

David C. Iglesias told committee members he felt "leaned on" by Sen. Pete V. Domenici and Rep. Heather A. Wilson of New Mexico.

Mrs. Wilson "wanted to talk about sealed indictments," said Mr. Iglesias, an appointee of President Bush. "I felt leaned on. I felt pressure to get these things moving."

Mr. Iglesias said Mr. Domenici hung up on him when told not to expect any indictments before the November elections.

While campaigning for re-election, Mrs. Wilson cast her Democratic opponent, Attorney General Patricia Madrid, as soft on corruption.

The Justice Department firings of Mr. Iglesias and seven other U.S. prosecutors are shaping up to be the first major investigation by the Democrat-led Congress.

"They were fired for no reason -- or worse, a political agenda," Chairman Charles E. Schumer, New York Democrat, said at the opening of the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing.

Justice Department officials say the prosecutors were fired for performance-related issues.

"This may take a lot of time and a lot of hearings," said Sen. Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania, the committee's ranking Republican.

Mr. Domenici and Mrs. Wilson said they did not intend to pressure Mr. Iglesias about his case.

"In the fall of last year, I was told by a constituent with knowledge of ongoing investigations that U.S. Attorney David Iglesias was intentionally delaying corruption prosecutions," Mrs. Wilson said yesterday.

"My call was not about any particular case or person, nor was it motivated by politics or partisanship. I did not ask about the timing of any indictments and I did not tell Mr. Iglesias what course of action I thought he should take or pressure him in any way."

Federal law-enforcement sources said some lawmakers were concerned about Mr. Iglesias' failure to convict David Hudak on arms dealing charges and his ability to convict former state Treasurer Robert Vigil on only one of 23 counts of extortion.

The House's ethics manual says the House and Senate recognize that a request for background information or a status report "may in effect be an indirect or subtle effort to influence the substantive outcome of the proceedings."

Carol Lam, a 2002 Bush appointee who oversaw the successful bribery prosecution of former Rep. Randy "Duke" Cunningham, California Republican, told the panel that she felt her termination was connected to complaints by a Republican legislator.

The Justice Department issued a request for her dismissal in January for not aggressively pursuing the prosecution of border crimes.

"I don't think anything we've done has been inconsistent with the mandates of the department," Mrs. Lam said. She said Rep. Darrell Issa, California Republican, called the Justice Department to question her efforts.

c Jerry Seper contributed to this story, which is based in part on wire service reports.

Ousted U.S. Attorneys Blast Bush Administration (MCT)

By Marisa Taylor, Margaret Talev And Les Blumenthal, McClatchy Newspapers

McClatchy, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON - Six former U.S. attorneys told two congressional committees Tuesday that Republican lawmakers and a congressional aide inquired about politically sensitive investigations, and their testimony raised new questions about whether the Bush administration removed the attorneys for political rather than professional reasons.

The U.S. attorneys, all of whom were appointed by President Bush, contradicted the administration's version of their sudden firings. Justice Department officials have downplayed the firings of eight U.S. attorneys as administrative decisions that were based on concerns about the attorneys' performance.

The U.S. attorneys testified before a House of Representatives subcommittee and the Senate Judiciary Committee that they were never given any specific reasons for their ousters. Two of them described interactions with Congress about criminal cases that Democrats have said could demonstrate that their removals were motivated by political considerations.

William E. Moschella, the principal associate deputy attorney general, called the charges of political interference "dangerous, baseless and irresponsible."

"This office has never removed a U.S. attorney to retaliate against them or prevent a public corruption investigation," he said. "Not once."

John McKay, the ousted U.S. attorney for western Washington state, revealed that the former chief of staff to Rep. Doc Hastings, R-Wash., called him in the weeks after the hotly contested 2004 Washington governor's race to ask about the status of an investigation into voter fraud by the Democrats. McKay's office looked into the allegations but never filed any charges. Christine Gregoire, a Democrat, eventually was declared the winner by 129 votes.

McKay said outside the hearing that top Bush aides were critical of his handling of the case when they interviewed him at the White House about becoming a federal judge.

David Iglesias, the former U.S. attorney in New Mexico, described separate phone calls from Republicans Sen. Pete Domenici and Rep. Heather Wilson about a corruption probe that involved at least one Democrat a month before the November elections and weeks before he was fired. At the time, Wilson was in a re-election race that she later won by 875 votes out of nearly 211,000 cast.

The prosecutors' testimony provoked a new round of accusations that Republicans tried to interfere with U.S. attorneys, who are appointed by the president but are supposed to refrain from partisan politics.

Rep. Linda Sanchez, D-Calif., the chairwoman of the House subcommittee, said in an interview that she expected the House to hold more hearings, and she left open the possibility of calling White House and Republican Party figures, as well high-level Justice Department officials.

Also Tuesday, an e-mail describing a conversation between one of the prosecutors and a high-ranking Justice Department official was made public.

In an e-mail sent to five of the ousted prosecutors, former U.S. Attorney Bud Cummins of Arkansas said a Justice Department official told him that department officials feel "like they are taking unnecessary flak to avoid trashing each of us," he wrote. "I was tempted to challenge him and say something movie-like such as `are you threatening ME???'"

In his testimony Tuesday, Cummins described the call as "advice" rather than a threat.

Brian Roehrkasse, a Justice Department spokesman, said Cummins "twisted" a collegial conversation with Michael Elston, the chief of staff to Deputy Attorney General Paul McNulty, "into a perceived threat by former disgruntled employees grandstanding before Congress."

"Mike Elston did not tell any U.S. attorney what they should or should not say publicly about their departure, and any suggestion that such a conversation took place is ridiculous and not based on fact," he said.

Most of the prosecutors voiced frustration about not knowing why they were removed.

Daniel Bogden, the former U.S. attorney in Nevada, said he asked William Mercer, the acting assistant attorney general, why he was removed. Bogden quoted Mercer as saying that the administration had a "very short two-year window of opportunity, and this would be an opportunity to put others into these positions so they could build their resumes."

In a shift from the administration's previous explanation, Moschella of the Justice Department said the U.S. attorneys were removed "for reasons related to policy priorities and management," rather than solely "performance-related" reasons.

"In hindsight, perhaps the situation could have been handled better," he said. "Our failure to provide reasons has only served to fuel . . . wild and inaccurate speculation about our motives. That said, the department stands by its decisions."

Cummins' departure "was not for performance reasons," Moschella said, but because Justice officials thought Cummins didn't plan to serve out the rest of his term, and they wanted to find a spot for a former aide to Karl Rove, President Bush's top political strategist.

Democrats seized on the prosecutors' testimony to question whether the White House may have been more actively involved in the effort to oust certain prosecutors and replace them with partisan loyalists.

In an interview, McKay said his handling of the 2004 Washington governor's race came back to haunt him when he was interviewed about a federal judgeship by then-White House Counsel Harriet Miers and others in her office.

McKay said he was asked in the late summer or early fall of 2006 to explain the criticism of how he'd "mishandled" the governor's race investigation. McKay didn't reveal who asked the question, but he said it wasn't Miers.

McKay didn't get the nomination.

Most Republicans have maintained that the administration appeared to have valid reasons to fire the presidential appointees, and they accused the Democrats of grandstanding in their first use of their subpoena power since they took over the House and Senate in January.

The House panel's ranking Republican, Rep. Chris Cannon of Utah, called the hearing a "show trial," accused the former U.S. attorneys of behaving "disingenuously" and said there was "not a shred of hard evidence" that their removals were coordinated politically.

Iglesias' allegations have prompted a liberal public-interest group to file ethics complaints against Domenici and Wilson. The two New Mexico lawmakers have acknowledged making the calls to inquire about the corruption case, but they have insisted they didn't try to pressure Iglesias.

Former Hastings aide Ed Cassidy's telephone call also could raise ethics questions, even though McKay testified that he stopped Cassidy before the conversation "crossed the line." McKay also said the FBI hadn't launched a formal investigation at the time, although the allegations of voter fraud had been widely publicized.

Cassidy, who appeared briefly to listen to the testimony, described the conversation as a "routine effort to determine whether allegations of voter fraud in the 2004 gubernatorial election were, or were not, being investigated by federal authorities."

"As the top aide to the chairman of the House Ethics Committee, I understood the permissible limits on any such conversation," he said. "Mr. McKay understood and respected those boundaries as well."

Cassidy is now a senior adviser to House Minority Leader John Boehner, R-Ohio, and, among other things, advises Boehner on congressional ethics. Hastings chaired the House Ethics Committee from February 2005 until Democrats took control of the House earlier this year. He's now the ranking Republican on the committee, known as the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Dismissed Federal Prosecutors Testify In Congress (LAT)

By Richard A. Serrano, Times Staff Writer

The Los Angeles Times, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON — A fired federal prosecutor described Tuesday how two Republican lawmakers from New Mexico made him feel "sick" after they called him -- in one case at his home -- to ask about criminal charges against Democrats last fall, just as one of the officeholders faced a tight re-election race.

The former prosecutor, David C. Iglesias, told congressional committees investigating the firing of him and seven other U.S. attorneys that in mid-October, Rep. Heather Wilson grilled him over the phone for information about possible sealed indictments in a call to his hotel room in Washington.

Two weeks later, Iglesias said, Sen. Pete Domenici called him at home, expressed disgust that there would be no indictments against Democrats in New Mexico before the November election, and slammed down the phone.

"I felt sick afterwards," Iglesias said. "I felt leaned on. I felt pressured to get these cases moving."

Iglesias joined five other former U.S. attorneys in a pair of hearings on Capitol Hill, all of them responding to subpoenas and sharing their disbelief and frustration over how they were abruptly terminated by Department of Justice officials.

DOJ_NMG_0141414

The prosecutors said they could see no clear reason why they were let go other than political motives, noting that supervisors in Washington had praised their work and given them glowing performance evaluations since President Bush took office in 2001.

One of them, Carol Lam of San Diego, successfully prosecuted former Rep. Randy "Duke" Cunningham, R-Calif., and yet was dismissed shortly after indicting two of his partners in a sweeping bribery case.

"In most of our cases," Lam said, speaking for the group of dismissed prosecutors, "we were given little or no information" about why they were terminated.

Attorney General Alberto Gonzales and Justice Department officials have stoutly defended the firings, saying they were done because expectations were not being met or simply to make room for other individuals to have a shot at the traditionally plum jobs.

Administration officials also have stressed that U.S. attorneys are political appointees -- a fact clearly understood by the fired prosecutors -- who serve at the pleasure of the president and can be removed at any time for any reason.

"The department stands by the decisions" to fire the eight prosecutors, William E. Moschella, principal associate deputy attorney general, told the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law.

"To be clear," he said, "it was for reasons related to policy, priorities and management that these U.S. attorneys were asked to resign."

He said the Justice Department "would have preferred" that the dismissals not become such a hot political issue. "In hindsight," he said, "perhaps this situation could have been handled better."

The firings have left most of the eight prosecutors angry. At Tuesday's hearings, H. E. "Bud" Cummins III, the former U.S. attorney in Little Rock, Ark., complained that he was pushed aside to make room for Timothy Griffin, a Republican operative for chief White House political adviser Karl Rove.

Cummins also charged that the administration has continued to hound the prosecutors. He said a top Justice Department official warned him last month against talking to the media or Congress about the firings -- a "threat" he passed on to his other former colleagues.

John McKay, the fired prosecutor in Seattle, said he was unnerved by requests not to go public.

Looking around the open hearing room on Capitol Hill, he told a large group of reporters and members of the Senate Judiciary Committee: "I did not feel at all intimidated. Instead, it made me angry. Hence my presence here."

McKay revealed a new allegation of political pressure. He said that in 2004, during a series of vote recounts in which a Democrat was narrowly elected governor in Washington state, the then-chief of staff for Rep. Doc Hastings, R-Wash., called him and started inquiring about the status of a federal investigation into vote fraud.

McKay said he quickly cut off the caller, whom he identified as Ed Cassidy, because McKay felt the conversation might constitute obstruction of justice. "I was concerned and dismayed by the call," McKay said.

Hastings, who in 2005 and '06 chaired the House ethics committee and remains its ranking GOP member, said Cassidy's call and the phone conversation were "entirely appropriate."

He added, "It was a simple inquiry and nothing more." He said of McKay, "I simply cannot understand why he didn't just pick up the phone to make me aware of his concern about my aide's call."

Iglesias admitted that he also did not report the phone calls from Wilson and Domenici, and said he came forward about them only after he was fired.

He said he was hesitant at first because Wilson, a House member since 1998, had been a "friend and ally" in New Mexico politics, and because he considered Domenici, a 34-year veteran of the Senate, to be a "mentor."

"I felt a conflict between my loyalty to them and my duty to report," Iglesias said.

But he said he felt he was betrayed when he was fired, adding, "I've always been trained that loyalty is a two-way street. So upon further reflection I thought the right thing to do was to go public."

(Optional add end)

Iglesias offered the most riveting testimony at Tuesday's hearings in describing the two phone calls, which Wilson and Domenici have acknowledged they made but have denied were aimed at putting any pressure on the prosecutor.

Last fall, Iglesias said, his office was investigating allegations of Democratic corruption in New Mexico at a time when Wilson and Patricia Madrid, the Democratic state attorney general, were battling each other for Wilson's House seat. Wilson eventually won in a squeaker.

He said Wilson called him at his Washington hotel room on Oct. 16. They first joked about his being in Washington, he said, and then she changed the subject. She said she had been hearing about sealed indictments.

"Red flags went up in my head," Iglesias said. "We cannot talk about sealed indictments."

He said he responded evasively to her and ended the call. "She was not happy," Iglesias recalled.

The call to him two weeks later was placed by Domenici's chief of staff, Steve Bell, and Iglesias said he took it in his bedroom at his home as his wife was nearby. Bell told Iglesias that their office was getting complaints from citizens, and Bell then handed the phone over to the senator.

Iglesias said Domenici wanted to know if any indictments would be filed before the Nov. 7 election. The prosector said, "I don't think so." The senator, Iglesias said, responded, "I'm very sorry to hear that."

And then, Iglesias said, "the line went dead."

Fired U.S. Attorneys Allege Improper Contacts (CHIT)

By Karoun Demirjian

Chicago Tribune, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON -- Several former U.S. attorneys told two congressional committees Tuesday that they felt political pressure from the Bush administration to remain silent about the circumstances of their firings.

H.E. "Bud" Cummins, ousted from his East Arkansas post last summer —and replaced by a former aide to White House political operative Karl Rove — told the Senate Judiciary Committee that in late February he received a troubling phone call from Mike Elston, chief of staff to deputy Attorney General Paul McNulty.

"He indicated that if the controversy continued to be stirred up, more damaging information might come out," said Cummins, who passed on the conversation to the other dismissed U.S. attorneys in an email he presented to the committee. "It might have been a threat, observation, or prediction. But I was very concerned for my colleagues."

John McKay, a former U.S. Attorney in western Washington state and one of seven federal prosecutors told to resign on Dec. 7, said, "I took it to mean that any work with Congress or testimony would be seen as an escalation from the Department of Justice, and they would respond accordingly. I felt that was a threat and hugely inappropriate. But while it was a threat, I'm not intimidated and I don't think my colleagues are either."

McKay and Cummins were joined in their testimony by former U.S. Attorneys Carol Lam of San Diego, best known for her successful prosecution of former Rep. Randy "Duke" Cunningham (R-Calif.), and David Iglesias of New Mexico, a former Navy prosecutor who was the inspiration for Tom Cruise's character in "A Few Good Men." All four also testified before the House Judiciary Committee and were joined there by former U.S. Attorneys Daniel Bogden of Nevada and Paul Charlton of Arizona.

Their complaints about feeling pressured by the Bush administration to keep quiet about their dismissals are the latest chapter in what has incrementally grown into a serious political problem for the White House.

"There is so much evidence of the political interest of justice officials carrying weight over the career lawyers," said Thomas Mann, a political analyst with the Brookings Institution. "My view is that will potentially be quite harmful to the administration."

Over the weekend, Iglesias said he had received phone calls from his one-time mentor, Sen. Pete Domenici (R-N.M.), and Rep. Heather Wilson (R-N.M.), asking if indictments in a high-profile political corruption case would be handed down before the November elections.

"Red flags went up," Iglesias said. "I felt sick."

The Justice Department confirmed that Domenici later contacted high-level department officials with complaints about Iglesias.

Iglesias' story comes only weeks after Attorney General Alberto Gonzales told the Senate Judiciary Committee that he would "never, ever make a change in the United States attorney position for political reasons."

But shifting details in the administration's official explanations have convinced some Democrats that the attorneys in question were basically fired for political reasons.

"With virtually no documentary evidence on performance problems on the part of the fired U.S. Attorneys…what are we to think?" asked Sen. Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.), who chaired the Senate committee meeting.

U.S. Attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President, who is legally entitled to terminate an appointee's tenure for any or no reason.

"The Democrats are on the offensive against this president, who is a deeply politically vulnerable president," said Mark Moeller of the Cato Institute, a libertarian think tank. "This is a good way for the Democrats to portray the president as a lawless president."

The White House continues to insist that in all cases apart from Cummins's, the firings were based on their poor job performance. Associate Deputy Attorney General William Moschella told the House Judiciary Committee Tuesday that several attorneys had not been diligent in pursuing Justice Department policies, such as Lam, whose gun prosecution numbers, he said, were simply too low.

"She only beat out Guam and the Virgin Islands in that area," he said.

Lam defended her record. "It's a balancing act, and it does concern me that lack of pursuit of one of 20 or 30 priorities would be used as a reason to dismiss a U.S. Attorney," she said.

When asked, all the former U.S. Attorneys rejected the notion that job-performance related issues could have precipitated their dismissals. Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.) suggested that the prosecutors may have been removed so the administration could appoint more political supporters, as was the case with Cummins's dismissal, by taking advantage of a little-known provision of the Patriot Act Reauthorization that allows the president to make indefinite interim U.S. Attorney appointments.

She and Sen. Arlen Specter (R-Pa.) have drafted a bill, currently facing Republican opposition on the Senate floor, to reinstitute a 120-day time limit for presidential appointees to receive Senate confirmation.

"It would be helpful if the Department of Justice would be a little more sensitive about what they're doing," Specter said. "To replace seven U.S. attorneys all at once is not exactly a discreet thing to do."

Ousted US Attorney Warned 'Gloves Will Come Off' (FT)

By Brooke Mastersin Washington

Financial Times, March 7, 2007

A top official at the Justice Department warned one of the eight US attorneys ousted last year that the Bush administration would "take the gloves off" and retaliate if the fired prosecutors continued to talk publicly about the issue, Bud Cummins, the former US attorney from Arkansas, testified yesterday.

"It might have been a threat. It might have been a warning. It might have been a prediction," Mr Cummins told the Senate judiciary committee of his February 20 conversation with Mike Elston, the chief of staff to Paul McNulty, the deputy attorney-general. Mr Cummins immediately e-mailed the warning to five fellow ousted prosecutors.

Mr Cummins' testimony came as the committee investigated the unprecedented midterm removal of at least eight attorneys, including seven who were called on a single day in December and told to resign.

"It seems all too likely that some in the administration were seeking to turn US attorneys into political -operatives," said Chuck Schumer, who chaired the hearing.

US attorneys, who supervise most federal criminal cases, are appointed by the president and confirmed by the Senate. The Justice Department said that most of the eight had performance problems. Brian Roehrkasse, a department spokesman, also took issue with Mr Cummins' testimony, saying, "A private and collegial conversation . . . is now somehow being twisted into a perceived threat by former disgruntled employees grandstanding before Congress."

Another former US attorney, David Iglesias of New Mexico, testified he believed he was fired because he had failed to yield to political pressure to speed up corruption cases involving Democrats. Senator Pete Domenici and Representative Heather Wilson, both Republicans, have acknowledged contacting Mr Iglesias in October, just before a close election, but have denied they intended to put pressure on the prosecutor.

Mr Iglesias testified that he "felt sick" and "leaned on" after a phone call in which he said Mr Domenici asked if the investigation would result in indictments before election day.

Democrats also asked whether Carol Lam, the San Diego US attorney, was fired because she directed the -corruption prosecution of Randy "Duke" Cunningham, a former Republican congressman. Ms Lam said that, when she asked why she was being fired, "I was told they didn't see why that information would be helpful to me".

Fired Prosecutor Says He Was Warned To Keep Quiet (Update2) (BLOOM)

By Robert Schmidt

Bloomberg, March 7, 2007

March 6 (Bloomberg) -- A prosecutor dismissed by the Bush administration last year said he and other former U.S. attorneys were warned to keep quiet about their firings by a senior Justice Department official.

H.E. ``Bud'' Cummins told the Senate Judiciary Committee that Mike Elston, the deputy attorney general's top aide, threatened him with retaliation in a phone call last month if he went public. Cummins said he passed the warning on to five U.S. attorneys who were ousted last December, believing that was what Elston wanted.

``They feel like they are taking unnecessary flak to avoid trashing each of us specifically or further, but if they feel like any of us intend to continue to offer quotes to the press, or to organize behind-the-scenes congressional pressure, then they would feel forced to somehow pull their gloves off,'' Cummins wrote in an e-mail to the other fired prosecutors that was released by the committee today.

Cummins, of Little Rock, Arkansas, testified today along with former U.S. Attorneys Carol Lam of San Diego, David Iglesias of Albuquerque, New Mexico, and John McKay of Seattle.

DOJ_NMG_0141417

Iglesias said that Republican Senator Pete Domenici hung up on him in anger after the prosecutor said he wasn't going to bring indictments before the November elections in a local corruption case involving Democrats. ``I felt leaned on," Iglesias said.

A Firestorm

The four ex-U.S. attorneys were among eight prosecutors, all Republican appointees, notified by the Justice Department last year that they were being let go. Two of the remaining four, Daniel Bogden of Nevada and Paul Charlton of Arizona, added their views this afternoon in testimony before a House Judiciary subcommittee.

The dismissals prompted Democrats to compare the firings to the so-called Saturday Night Massacre in 1973 when President Richard M. Nixon dismissed Watergate special prosecutor Archibald Cox.

Today, Democrats demanded to know whether the Bush administration forced out the prosecutors to influence politically sensitive criminal investigations. Most of the ex- U.S. attorneys were supervising at least one high-profile corruption probe.

William Moschella, a Justice Department official, told the House panel the prosecutors were ousted for legitimate reasons, including poor management, differences over death penalty policies and failure to crack down on illegal immigration. Cummins was asked to leave to create an opening for a former aide to Karl Rove, Moschella said.

Poor Handling

``In hindsight, perhaps this situation could have been handled better," Moschella said. The agency's failure to explain the firings to the U.S. attorneys ``only served to fuel wild and inaccurate speculation about our motives."

Democrats on both the Senate Judiciary Committee and the House Judiciary subcommittee said they will continue to press for an explanation from Justice Department officials.

``We will not rest until we get the answers we seek," said New York Democratic Senator Charles Schumer.

Senator Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania, the senior Republican on the committee, agreed.

``It is very important to withhold judgment on the allegations until we have worked through this very complex" matter, said Specter. ``This may take a lot of time and a lot of hearings."

Show Trial

On the House side, Republicans likened the hearing to a political show trial, pointing out that President George W. Bush has the authority to fire prosecutors at will.

Representative Christopher Cannon, a Utah Republican, chastised Democrats for trying to ``stir up a groundless partisan controversy." The prosecutors ``are not entitled to their jobs," he said.

In his e-mail to the other fired prosecutors, Cummins said Elston ``reacted quite a bit to the idea of anyone voluntarily testifying" before Congress. ``It seemed clear that they would see that as a major escalation of the conflict meriting some kind of unspecified form of retaliation."

Questioned by Specter, Cummins said he couldn't say for sure Elston was passing along a threat.

`Friendly Advice'

``Some people would want to interpret it as a threat, but it could also be, `hey, there's some friendly advice,'" Cummins said. ``I've attempted to not characterize the call, I just tried to pass the substance on to my colleagues."

Brian Roehrkasse, a Justice Department spokesman, said Elston never told the fired prosecutors what to say in public.

``A private and collegial conversation between Mike Elston and Bud Cummins is now somehow being twisted into a perceived threat by former disgruntled employees grandstanding before Congress," Roehrkasse said.

Iglesias testified today that Domenici and Republican Representative Heather Wilson, both of New Mexico, pressured him in phone calls last October to move forward on the corruption case.

Iglesias said Wilson asked him about sealed indictments and he provided ``evasive and non-responsive answers."

When Domenici called him about the probe at home two weeks later, Iglesias said he ``felt sick afterwards."

Both lawmakers have acknowledged making the calls but said they didn't seek to influence any case or to pressure Iglesias.

The 93 U.S. attorneys are appointed by the president and serve at his discretion. The positions require Senate confirmation.

Ousted U.S. Attorney Says He Felt 'leaned On' By Senator's Call (USAT)

By Kevin Johnson

USA Today, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON — A former federal prosecutor who was fired by the Bush administration said Tuesday that he "felt sick" and "leaned on" after New Mexico's Republican senator called him last fall and asked whether a corruption probe of local Democrats would result in charges by Election Day.

David Iglesias, the former U.S. attorney in Albuquerque, described the late October call to his home by Sen. Pete Domenici as an "unprecedented" and inappropriate effort to influence an active investigation. Iglesias said that when he told Domenici the probe would not be resolved before the elections, the senator said he was "sorry to hear that" and abruptly hung up.

"I felt sick afterward," Iglesias told the Senate Judiciary Committee, adding that "red flags went up. It's like calling a scientist" at the government-owned Sandia National Laboratories in New Mexico "and talking about (secret nuclear) launch codes." Congressional ethics rules prohibit lawmakers from trying to influence authorities involved in criminal investigations.

Six weeks after the call, Iglesias said, he was asked to resign.

Iglesias' account of his conversation with Domenici, and a similar one with Rep. Heather Wilson, R-N.M., was part of a cascade of fresh allegations heard Tuesday by House and Senate lawmakers who are examining the Bush administration's firing of eight U.S. attorneys. The Senate and House Judiciary committees are looking into whether the firings of the prosecutors — who served at the pleasure of the president — went beyond politics to involve ethics violations by members of Congress, or worse.

Another ousted prosecutor, H.E. "Bud" Cummins of Little Rock, told the Senate panel that a Justice Department official suggested to him last month that the administration would "retaliate" if the prosecutors spoke publicly about their firings or cooperated with congressional panels investigating the dismissals.

Cummins later described last month's call from Mike Elston, chief of staff to Deputy Attorney General Paul McNulty, as "friendly advice." However, three other ousted prosecutors who were informed of Elston's message told the senators that such action could be interpreted as a threat, potential witness intimidation or obstruction of justice.

The Justice Department's Brian Roehrkasse said Elston did not try to silence the fired prosecutors or prevent them from cooperating with Congress.

In separate statements, Domenici and Wilson acknowledged calling Iglesias but said they did not try to pressure or threaten him. Domenici said he merely was checking on the "time-frame" of a corruption probe involving alleged kickbacks to public officials in the construction of a courthouse.

Testifying before the House panel, William Moschella, principal associate deputy attorney general, defended the firings. He said seven of the prosecutors were ousted because of poor job performance. McNulty said in February that Cummins had been cleared out to make way for Tim Griffin, a former aide to White House adviser Karl Rove. Griffin has since said he will not seek the post permanently.

Iglesias Speaks To Senate Committee (ALBTRIB)

By James W. Brosnan, Kate Nash

Albuquerque Tribune, March 7, 2007

Iglesias says Domenici, Wilson pressured him on corruption case

WASHINGTON — Fired U.S. Attorney David Iglesias testified today that he "felt sick" after an October phone call from his onetime mentor, U.S. Sen. Pete Domenici, asking whether indictments in an Albuquerque corruption case would be issued before the November elections.

"He asked, `Are those going to be filed before November?' " Iglesias told the Senate Judiciary Committee. "I said I didn't think so. He said, `I'm very sorry to hear that.' And then the line went dead.

"I felt sick afterwards," Iglesias said. "I felt leaned on to get this moving."

Iglesias, the U.S. attorney for New Mexico, also testified about an October phone call from U.S. Rep. Heather Wilson, who was locked in a re-election battle with then-state Attorney General Patricia Madrid. Iglesias said Wilson asked him about "sealed indictments" in the case.

Iglesias told the committee that he believed the brief phone calls from the two Albuquerque Republicans in the weeks prior to the Nov. 7 elections were an attempt to involve his office in the 1st Congressional District battle.

Iglesias also revealed in the first of two high-profile congressional hearings today that he had been warned by a fellow fired U.S. attorney that the Justice Department might retaliate if he testified before Congress.

Iglesias said Wilson called him about Oct. 16 and said "she had been hearing about sealed indictments. What can you tell me about sealed indictments?"

"Red flags went up," Iglesias said. "We cannot talk about sealed indictments."

Iglesias said he responded that prosecutors occasionally seal indictments in national security cases, "and she was not happy with that answer."

Domenici called Iglesias at his home about two weeks later and also asked about the investigation into kickbacks in a courthouse construction contract purportedly involving high-profile Democrats.

The Justice Department asked for Iglesias' resignation six weeks later.

DOJ_NMG_0141419

Sen. Arlen Specter, a Pennsylvania Republican, asked Iglesias why he did not report the calls to the Justice Department, as he was required, noting that the immediacy of a complaint adds to a witness's credibility.

Iglesias responded that he did not do so because he felt loyalty to Domenici as a mentor and Wilson as a "friend and ally."

But he changed his mind about going public in mid-January, he said.

"Loyalty is a two-way street," he said. "I think they (Domenici and Wilson) were behind me being asked to resign."

Conflicting stories

Today was the first time Iglesias named the two members of Congress who he said in interviews with the media last week had contacted him.

Iglesias' testimony today contradicted the public statements of Domenici and Wilson on some points. Domenici, who initially told reporters last week that "I have no idea what he (Iglesias) is talking about," this weekend acknowledged making the phone call. But he denied pressuring Iglesias and made no mention of asking Iglesias specifically about indictments "before November."

Wilson, who last week declined to comment on Iglesias' statement by saying it was a personnel matter, on Monday released a written statement saying she had made the phone call on behalf of a constituent. Her statement said she called to discuss an allegation that Iglesias was moving slowly on the indictments and that he told her he had very few people to deal with corruption cases.

Iglesias today denied they discussed resource issues in the call.

Today's hearing also resulted in the release of a Feb. 20 e-mail from H.E. Cummins, another fired U.S. attorney from Little Rock, in which he told Iglesias and four other fired U.S. attorneys that a senior Justice Department official had told him if they persisted in talking to the media the department "would feel forced to somehow pull their gloves off and offer public criticisms to defend their actions more fully."

Cummins said he personally believed the warning from Mike Elston was a "big deal," but he felt obliged to tell his fired colleagues before they gave any more interviews.

Iglesias said he took the e-mail "as a warning shot across the bow."

"It didn't intimidate me. It made me angry," said Iglesias, who has noted that he had received positive job evaluations prior to his firing.

A Justice Department official was scheduled to testify this afternoon at a hearing of a House Judiciary subcommittee where Iglesias and three other fired U.S. attorneys were also scheduled to testify.

Pressure rising

Today's testimony is likely to step up pressure on the House and Senate ethics committees to investigate the phone calls by Domenici and Wilson.

Wilson ended six days of silence about the firing Monday. Both Domenici and Wilson contend they were calling Iglesias on behalf of constituents, which members of Congress are allowed to do under congressional ethics rules. However, calling to put pressure on a federal officer is not permitted.

"I did not ask about the timing of any indictments, and I did not tell Mr. Iglesias what course of action I thought he should take or pressure him in any way," Wilson wrote in her statement.

"The conversation was brief and professional."

Wilson has repeatedly declined to talk to New Mexico news media about the situation.

She released the statement amid heat from Democrats to talk and queries from political wags wondering why she refused to break her silence. At the time of her call, she was neck-and-neck with Madrid, whom Wilson had accused of being soft on government corruption.

The Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee on Monday called on Wilson to address the issue, and a citizens' group filed an ethics complaint against her today.

"Heather Wilson's silence is deafening," said Jennifer Crider of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee in a statement Monday. "If she didn't do anything wrong, why won't she say so?"

In her initial statement, Wilson said a constituent, whom she did not identify, said, "Iglesias was intentionally delaying corruption investigations." She also said she wanted to help Iglesias.

In a statement released today, Wilson said the constituent was someone "with knowledge of ongoing investigations." She called the allegation against Iglesias "deeply troubling."

During her phone call to Iglesias, Wilson said, he denied any intentional delay.

"If the purpose of my call has somehow been misperceived, I am sorry for any confusion. I thought it was important for Mr. Iglesias to receive this information and if necessary, have the opportunity to clear his name," she said.

A political tempest

The firings of Iglesias and seven other U.S. attorneys have created a political tempest in Washington. On Monday, Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington filed an ethics complaint against Domenici and a similar complaint against Wilson today.

But CREW Executive Director Melanie Sloan said, "I'm not holding my breath" that either the House or the Senate will act on the complaints.

In the House, CREW would first have to find a member willing to sponsor the complaint against Wilson, because the ethics committee is not required to consider complaints by outside groups. The ethics committee could investigate on its own initiative, but rarely does so.

Domenici would not respond to questions Monday about the ethics complaint. But Steve Bell, Domenici's chief of staff, told The Tribune that it's "probably 50-50" whether the ethics committee will consider the complaint.

CREW contends Domenici violated Senate rules by interfering in an investigation.

"You don't call right before an election about a pending corruption investigation," Sloan said.

But Bell said the call in mid-October was not a violation of ethics rules because it had been publicly reported that the FBI had turned over its information to Iglesias, and constituents were asking Domenici what was going on.

CREW is known for filing complaints against Republicans, but its complaint drew support Monday from a more conservative group.

Judicial Watch President Tom Fitton said politics should be kept out of corruption investigations, and if Domenici had a question about the investigation he should have contacted Justice Department officials in Washington, not the U.S. attorney in charge of the case.

Carl Tobias, a professor of law at the University of Richmond who has studied ethics law, said there may need to be an investigation to determine what was said to Iglesias and whether the timing was politically motivated.

"It isn't clear to me there is a violation, but sometimes the appearance is just as bad as the reality," Tobias said.

If found guilty of ethics violations, Domenici or Wilson, theoretically, could face penalties ranging from a private admonishment to expulsion, but Tobias predicted at most it would be "a slap on the wrist."

Justice Department spokeswoman Tasia Scolinos confirmed that Domenici called U.S. Attorney General Alberto Gonzales three times - in September 2005 and January and April 2006 - to urge him to replace Iglesias. He also called Deputy Attorney General Paul McNulty with the same message in October. Scolinos said Domenici raised several "general concerns" about Iglesias but did not refer to any specific case in any of the calls.

Domenici had recommended President Bush appoint Iglesias in 2001. Bell said the disenchantment with Iglesias began in 2003 with the failure to convict David Hudak, a Canadian accused of gun violations while running an anti-terrorism school near Roswell.

Bell said Domenici's displeasure grew with Iglesias' handling of other, bigger cases and the deployment of resources to deal with crimes involving illegal immigration and border security.

Sen. Jeff Bingaman, a Silver City Democrat, told reporters he thought Iglesias was doing a good job, although he shared Domenici's concerns about whether the office had enough resources to deal with illegal immigration.

Meanwhile, Domenici found out Monday just how big a media sensation the case has become.

Nine camera crews and dozens of reporters showed up for a news conference at the Capitol, where Domenici and several other senators announced the re-introduction of legislation to increase spending on science and engineering education and research by $16 billion over four years.

When asked about the Iglesias affair, Domenici referred a reporter to his previous statement.

Iglesias' firing has fired up Democrats in New Mexico, as well.

Gov. Bill Richardson - who is seeking the Democratic presidential nomination - said the calls Iglesias received should be investigated.

"I'm very troubled by it. I think David Iglesias was a good law enforcement official, and it was inappropriate for political leaders to call and pressure him, totally inappropriate. And it should be thoroughly investigated," the governor said.

Q&A: Hiring And Firing Of U.S. Attorneys (AP)

By Mark Sherman

AP, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON - The recent firing of eight U.S. attorneys has raised questions about how they are appointed and the circumstances under which they may be dismissed. Here are some questions and answers:

Q: What do U.S. attorneys do and how many are there?

A: U.S. attorneys are the federal government's equivalent of local district attorneys. They are charged with prosecuting federal crimes in the judicial district in which they serve. There are 93 U.S. attorneys, one for each U.S. district court (except that Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands share a federal prosecutor).

Q: Who gets these positions?

A: The highly prized jobs typically are given to politically well-connected lawyers, and often serve as a stepping stone to elective office or a judgeship. Supreme Court Justice Samuel Alito was the U.S. attorney in Newark when he was tapped to be a federal appeals court judge. Former Massachusetts Gov. William Weld had previously been the U.S. attorney in Boston. FBI Director Robert Mueller was the top federal prosecutor in San Francisco.

Q: How do they get the job?

A: The president nominates them, usually based on recommendations from senators of his own party in that state. The Senate confirms them for a term of four years, but they may continue serving beyond that time until a successor is chosen. A U.S. attorney may be dismissed sooner by the president for any reason at all, under federal law. When a U.S. attorney's position is vacant, the attorney general is empowered to choose an interim prosecutor, who can continue in office until the president nominates and the Senate confirms a permanent replacement.

Q: Has the process always worked this way?

A: No. Last year's renewal of the USA Patriot Act, the Bush administration's prime anti-terror law, contained a provision that abolished limits on how long interim prosecutors may serve. For 20 years, the attorney general could choose someone to serve as U.S. attorney for 120 days, after which a federal judge could pick a prosecutor who would serve until the confirmation of a permanent replacement. Democrats have accused the Justice Department of seeking to use the new law to install new U.S. attorneys without going through the Senate confirmation process. Attorney General Alberto Gonzales has said his interim choices all would be submitted to the Senate.

Legislation has been introduced to revert to the old process for filling the jobs on a temporary basis.

Q: How often are U.S. attorneys fired?

A: Excluding the current controversy, the Congressional Research Service found just five instances over 25 years in which U.S. attorneys were fired by the president or resigned following reports of questionable conduct. A Reagan-era prosecutor was fired and later convicted in federal court in connection with charges that he leaked confidential information. A Clinton appointee resigned over allegations he bit a topless dancer on the arm during a visit to an adult club following a loss in a big drug case. The CRS study did not include departures that followed a change in presidential administration, when turnover is common.

Reasons Given For Prosecutors Firings (AP)

AP, March 7, 2007

What the Justice Department has said about six U.S. attorneys who were asked to resign. Under each prosecutor are comments from previous department-issued performances reviews and then statements Tuesday by William Moschella, an associate deputy attorney general, about the reasons given that the prosecutors were asked to step down. He testified before a House Judiciary subcommittee.

CAROL LAM, U.S. attorney in San Diego

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT TESTIMONY: "Her gun prosecution numbers are at the bottom of the list. ... (On immigration cases), her numbers for a border district just didn't stack up."

2005 PERFORMANCE REVIEW: "An effective manager and respected leader ... respected by the judiciary, law enforcement agencies, and (U.S. attorney's office) staff."

JOHN McKAY, U.S. attorney in Seattle

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT TESTIMONY: "The department really had policy differences and were concerned with the manner in which he went about advocating the particular policies ... on information sharing. He spent quite a considerable amount of time advocating for a particular system."

2006 PERFORMANCE REVIEW: "An effective, well-regarded and capable leader ... (who) established strategic goals that were appropriate to meet the priorities of the department."

BUD CUMMINS, U.S. attorney in Little Rock, Ark.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT TESTIMONY: "His was not for performance-based reasons. ... The administration asked Mr. Cummins to move on only after we knew that he had indicated he was not going to serve out the remainder of his term."

2006 PERFORMANCE REVIEW: "Very competent and highly regarded by the federal judiciary, law enforcement and civil client agencies. ... Established strategic goals that were appropriate to meet the priorities of the department."

DOJ_NMG_0141422

DANIEL BOGDEN, U.S. attorney for Nevada

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT TESTIMONY: "There was no particular deficiency. There was an interest in seeing renewed energy and renewed vigor in that office, really taking it to the next level."

2003 PERFORMANCE REVIEW: "Highly regarded by the federal judiciary, the law enforcement and civil client agencies, and the staff of the (U.S. attorney's office). He was a capable leader."

DAVID IGLESIAS, U.S. attorney for New Mexico

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT TESTIMONY: "The district was in need of greater leadership. ... Mr. Iglesias had delegated to his first assistant the overall running of his office. U.S. attorneys are hired to run the office."

2005 PERFORMANCE REVIEW: "Experienced in legal, management and community relations work and was respected by the judiciary, agencies and staff. ... Had a well conceived strategic plan that complied with department priorities."

PAUL CHARLTON, U.S. attorney in Arizona

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT TESTIMONY: "Mr. Charlton had undertaken in his district a policy with regard to the taping of FBI interviews and set a policy in place there that had national ramifications. It did not go through the whole policy process. ... On the death penalty, we have a process in the Department of Justice. It is the one area that is nondelegable by the attorney general which (Mr. Charlton), in a particular case was told and authorized to seek in a particular case. He chose instead to continue to litigate after that long and exhaustive process."

2003 PERFORMANCE REVIEW: "Well respected by the (U.S. attorney's office) staff, investigative and civil client agencies, local law enforcement community, Native American nations, and judiciary regarding his integrity, professionalism and competence."

They Lost My Confidence (USAT)

By Alberto R. Gonzales

USA Today, March 7, 2007

As any employer or manager knows, the handling of personnel matters — especially the termination of employees — is one of the most challenging tasks in any business. Personnel matters in the federal government are no exception.

To be clear, it was for reasons related to policy, priorities and management — what have been referred to broadly as "performance-related" reasons — that seven U.S. attorneys were asked to resign last December.

The Justice Department, out of respect for these individuals, would have preferred not to talk publicly about those reasons, but disclosures in the press and requests for information from Congress altered those best-laid plans. Although our reasons for their dismissal were appropriate, our failure to provide those reasons to these individual U.S. attorneys at the time they were asked to resign has only served to fuel wild and inaccurate speculation about our motives. That is very unfortunate because faith and confidence in our justice system are more important than any one individual.

We have never asked a U.S. attorney to resign in an effort to retaliate against him or her or to inappropriately interfere with a public corruption case (or any other type of case, for that matter). Indeed, during the last six years, the department has established an extremely strong record of rooting out public corruption, including prosecuting a number of very high-profile cases.

Like me, U.S. attorneys are political appointees, and we all serve at the pleasure of the president. If U.S. attorneys are not executing their responsibilities in a manner that furthers the management and policy goals of departmental leadership, it is appropriate that they be replaced. After all, the responsibility of the Department of Justice, and of the Congress, is to serve the people of the United States. While I am grateful for the public service of these seven U.S. attorneys, they simply lost my confidence. I hope that this episode ultimately will be recognized for what it is: an overblown personnel matter.

Alberto R. Gonzales is attorney general of the United States.

Fired U.S. Attorney Was Going Places (LAT)

By Nicholas Riccardi, Times Staff Writer

The Los Angeles Times, March 7, 2007

Observers had David C. Iglesias pegged as a rising GOP star.

Until recently, David C. Iglesias was best known in New Mexico as one of the role models for the military lawyer Tom Cruise played in "A Few Good Men."

A trim, straight-backed former Navy lawyer, Iglesias rode that all-American reputation to high levels in Republican politics: He nearly became the state attorney general and was appointed U.S. attorney.

Now Iglesias has a new role: star witness. The Bush administration fired him in December and contended it was for poor job performance. On Tuesday, Iglesias, 49, told the Senate Judiciary Committee that two prominent Republican politicians had called him to ask whether indictments would be filed before the November election against Democratic politicians in an ongoing criminal investigation. In the weeks that followed, Iglesias and seven other federal prosecutors were forced to resign.

"I felt sick afterwards," Iglesias said of his response to the second call, which was made by Sen. Pete V. Domenici (R-N.M.).

To friends and observers in New Mexico, the only surprise is the speed at which the GOP establishment has turned on one of its rising stars.

"You'd be hard pressed to find a more ethical, straight-shooter type than David Iglesias," said Jerry Walz, an Albuquerque lawyer and longtime friend for whom Iglesias briefly worked. "Here you have this dramatic rise to a very prominent position. He has movie-star good looks in his own right. He has everything going for him, and this is why this is such a dramatic event."

Iglesias, an evangelical Christian, was born in Panama, where his father was a missionary. His family moved to New Mexico when he was 12. After graduating from the University of New Mexico's law school, Iglesias became a Navy judge advocate general.

In 1986, he was one of three JAGs who represented Marines accused of attempted murder for a hazing incident that their lawyers argued was encouraged by commanders at Guantanamo Bay. The successful defense helped the Marines avoid serious penalties, and the case inspired the hit Broadway play "A Few Good Men" and the later film. Iglesias was not consulted during the production of the play or movie.

He left the Navy but remains a captain in the reserves. He returned to New Mexico to start a family. Iglesias left a job in the Albuquerque city attorney's office to become a White House fellow in the Clinton administration. He then returned to New Mexico and ran for state attorney general in 1998, narrowly losing.

After George W. Bush was elected president in 2000, New Mexico Republicans, led by Domenici, lobbied for Iglesias' appointment as U.S. attorney. The expectation was that he would follow up his tenure with another run for public office.

"They felt they were grooming him for a political career," said Joe Monahan, a New Mexico political blogger.

Iglesias didn't make an initial splash. "He was very quiet," Monahan said. He earned the ire of the state GOP by refusing to prosecute anyone for voter fraud after the 2004 elections, despite some Republicans' contention that 15-year-olds voted. Iglesias said he could find no federal crimes.

The highlight of his term was the prosecution of state Treasurer Robert Vigil for extortion. Though Vigil is a Democrat from a prominent New Mexico political family, Iglesias' prosecution was seen as nonpartisan and was supported by Democratic Gov. Bill Richardson. The first trial ended in a mistrial, but Vigil was convicted last year.

At the same time, New Mexico media were full of speculation about Iglesias' investigation of local Democratic politicians' involvement in the construction of an Albuquerque courthouse. That was the case that Domenici and Republican Rep. Heather A. Wilson had inquired about. The two politicians have denied they were trying to influence Iglesias.

David Campbell, a Democrat who was Albuquerque's city attorney when Iglesias worked in the office, said his friend's actions showed his character.

"As a Bush appointee he's a stellar appointment, a right-wing evangelical Christian but somebody who plays his professional life with a lot of integrity," Campbell said. "You couldn't say a bad word about the guy."

nicholas.riccardi@latimes.com

Senior Aide Implicated (HILL)

By Susan Crabtree

The Hill, March 7, 2007

A Democratic probe into the firings of eight U.S. attorneys implicated yesterday a senior staffer for Rep. Doc Hastings (R-Wash.), the third GOP congressional office to become caught in the quickly escalating controversy in as many days.

During testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee, former U.S. Attorney John McKay said that Ed Cassidy, then-chief of staff to Hastings, called him in 2004 to ask whether he was investigating allegations of voter fraud after a Democrat won the Washington state governor's race in a third recount. At the time, McKay was serving as the chief federal law enforcement officer in Seattle.

McKay was one of seven U.S. attorneys fired by the administration in early December; another, H.E. "Bud" Cummins III, was relieved of his post last June. Democrats have demanded to know whether politics or the politically charged investigations that several of the U.S. attorneys had pusued had anything to do with their departures.

McKay said he responded to Cassidy's initial questions with publicly available information and then tried to stop the line of questioning when pressed. McKay said he thought that Cassidy's questions were related to internal U.S. attorney decisions about an investigation and were therefore improper under Justice Department ethics rules.

McKay said he stopped the conversation by asking Cassidy whether the aide was truly asking on behalf of his boss about an internal investigation or whether he was trying to lobby McKay to launch one, which would have been improper. Cassidy agreed that such questioning would be unethical and finished the conversation "in a most expeditious fashion," McKay said.

McKay said he was so alarmed afterwards that he called a meeting with two top officials in his office to discuss the matter and determine if he had responded appropriately.

Cassidy characterized his call to McKay as "routine" and said that he was well aware of the "permissible limits" on such a conversation and that both he and McKay respected those boundaries.

"My conversation with John McKay was a routine effort to determine whether allegations of voter fraud in the 2004 gubernatorial election were, or were not, being investigated by federal authorities," Cassidy said in the statement. "As the top aide to the chairman of the House Ethics Committee, I understood the permissible limits on any such conversation. Mr. McKay understood and respected those boundaries as well. I am pleased that Mr. McKay recalls both our agreement to respect these boundaries and my subsequent decision to end the conversation promptly."

The charges surrounding Cassidy's call have implications on many levels. Hastings went on to become chairman of the House ethics committee after then-Majority Leader Tom DeLay (R-Texas) purged the panel of its chairman, and at one point DeLay tried to make Cassidy its lead counsel. That move further intensified partisan divisions within the committee and rendered it largely inactive for months. Cassidy has since gone on to become a senior aide and floor assistant to Minority Leader John Boehner (R-Ohio), whom he also will advise on ethics matters.

Hastings remains the ranking member on the ethics panel following the Democratic takeover in November and he may be forced to consider if the panel should launch an investigation into whether Rep. Heather Wilson (R-N.M.) broke House ethics rules for her own call to a different U.S. attorney, David Iglesias, last year. Iglesias was among the seven fired in December.

Just weeks before last year's critical midterm election, Wilson called Iglesias to inquire about the progress of a public corruption case against a Democratic lawmaker. At the time, Wilson was running a close race and eventually won reelection by fewer than 1,000 votes. If Iglesias had handed down indictments before the election, they could have helped boost Republican prospects at the polls.

Sen. Pete Domenici (R-N.M.), who has close ties to Wilson, also recently admitted to calling Iglesias. Both Wilson and Domenici have denied that they said anything that would pressure Iglesias. The watchdog group Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington has called for House and Senate investigations into the calls that Wilson and Domenici made.

Yesterday Hastings waved off a question from a reporter, referring all inquiries into the matter to his office. Later, he issued a statement that there was nothing wrong with Cassidy's call to Iglesias.

"Ed Cassidy's call and the conversation that took place were entirely appropriate," Hastings's statement said. "It was a simple inquiry and nothing more — and it was the only call to any federal official from my office on this subject either during or after the recount ordeal."

Hastings also said he didn't understand why McKay didn't contact him if he was "truly dismayed" after the call.

"Tom McCabe of the Building Industry Association of Washington did contact my office in July of 2005 to ask that I urge the White House to replace Mr. McKay and I flat out refused to do so, which Ed Cassidy told him in the bluntest of terms," Hastings said.

Cassidy had worked for Hastings for 12 years. When he left for Boehner's office earlier this year, Cassidy praised Hastings as his "most trusted adviser and one of my closest friends."

Boehner also issued a statement yesterday evening.

"It is improper for anyone to attempt to unduly influence the initiation or outcome of an investigation," the statement said. "Given their backgrounds, both Mr. Cassidy and U.S. Attorney McKay were acutely aware of this fact. Accordingly, both have made it abundantly clear that no such impropriety took place during their conversation and, more importantly, that neither had any intention of pursuing a discourse that could be construed to be inappropriate."

Iglesias also testified yesterday, reiterating the charges that Domenici and Wilson tried to pressure him to move ahead with his investigation.

Meanwhile, a few GOP senators, such as Jon Kyl (Ariz.) and Jeff Sessions (Ala.), came to the administration's defense and charged that Democrats were politicizing the issue.

"Maybe the law should not have been changed, but these cases … are not Exhibits A through G that it should be changed," Kyl said. He said that the main Democratic argument concerning politicization "is probably untrue."

Kyl said he has talked to U.S. attorneys in Arizona many times, but never about any ongoing case.

At one point during the Senate hearing, another witness, Cummins of Arkansas, discussed a call he received from Michael Elston, the chief of staff to Deputy Attorney General Paul McNulty, about a comment that Cummins had given the Washington Post about the firings. Cummins later sent an e-mail warning the other fired U.S. attorneys that he believed Elston was hinting that the White House would retaliate if they continued to talk to the press, and especially if they agreed to testify before Congress about that matter.

During the Senate hearing, Sen. Sheldon Whitehouse (D-R.I.) asked all of the U.S. attorneys what they would have done if one of their witnesses in a big case had received a similar call. All four said they would inquire further to see if they should bring obstruction of justice or witness tampering charges.

In response to questions from Sen. Arlen Specter (R-Pa.), Cummins later said he believed one way to characterize Elston's call was "friendly advice." He added that an obstruction of justice charge would be a hard case to win if the call was the only evidence, because it dealt mainly with publicity surrounding the firings and did not speak directly to whether he or the other fired U.S. attorneys should testify in a court of law about the matter.

For their part, House Democratic leaders indicated that the ethics committee should launch an investigation into the U.S. attorneys matter, but said they do not plan to file a complaint.

"Am I going to file an ethics complaint? The answer is no," House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer (D-Md.) said. "When issues are raised in the public sphere, the ethics committee has an obligation to look at them and I hope they will do that."

The House ethics committee said yesterday it cannot comment on any possible investigation.

But Boehner came to his former staffer's defense. "Ed is a veteran congressional staffer and an authority on government ethics as well as House policies and procedures — we're fortunate to have him on our team," said Boehner, who noted that he has known Cassidy for more than a decade.

Jackie Kucinich, Elana Schor and Michael Soraghan contributed to this report.

Hearing On U.S. Attorney's Ouster Reveals Hastings' Office Contacted McKay (SEATIMES)

By David Bowermaster, Mike Carter And Alicia Mundy

The Seattle Times, March 7, 2007

During the recount of the hotly contested 2004 governor's race in Washington state, the chief of staff to Rep. Doc Hastings, R-Wash., called former U.S. Attorney John McKay to inquire about the status of any federal investigations into voter fraud, McKay told a Senate committee today.

McKay told the Senate Judiciary Committee that Ed Cassidy, who now works for Republican Minority Leader John Boehner, called him "some weeks" following the 2004 election, and after a third re-count had determined that Democrat Christine Gregoire had narrowly defeated Republican Dino Rossi.

"I was told the purpose of the call was to inquire on behalf of congressman Hastings" about the status of ongoing investigations of voter fraud, McKay said in response to a question from Sen. Dianne Feinstein.

McKay said that he informed Cassidy that the office of the U.S. Attorney for the Western District of Washington had already asked the public to contact the Federal Bureau of Investigation with any evidence of voter fraud, so it could be investigated.

Cassidy then began to ask McKay whether any future action would be taken by the U.S. Attorney's office with regard to the governor's race.

"When Mr. Cassidy called me on future action I stopped him and I told him I was sure that he wasn't asking me on behalf" of Congressman Hastings, McKay told the committee, "because we both knew that would be improper. [Cassidy] agreed it would be improper and he ended the conversation in a most expeditious manner."

McKay and six other former U.S. Attorneys were called on Dec. 7 and asked to resign within six weeks. They were not given a reason for the firing at the time.

The firings have raised concerns among Democrats in Congress that the firings were politically motivated.

On Monday, prior to the hearing, Todd Young, Rep. Hastings' current chief of staff, said that "to the best of my knowledge," Cassidy, never called McKay to ask the former U.S. Attorney to investigate the 2004 governor's race.

Cassidy stopped working for Hastings in mid-2005, when he left to join the House Ethics Committee -- which Hastings then chaired.

Young said he has never spoken to McKay, on any subject.

Young also said that Rep. Hastings did not call McKay himself about the 2004 election.

Cassidy said in a statement Tuesday afternoon that his conversation with McKay "was a routine effort to determine whether allegations of voter fraud in the 2004 gubernatorial election were, or were not, being investigated by federal authorities."

He said he understood the ethical boundaries of such a conversation and didn't violate them. Congressional rules prohibit House and Senate members from discussing ongoing investigations with federal prosecutors.

Hastings, in a statement also issued Tuesday, called Cassidy's conversation with McKay "entirely appropriate."

"It was a simple inquiry and nothing more -- and it was the only call to any federal official from my office on this subject either during or after the recount ordeal," Hastings said.

He said Tom McCabe, the executive vice president of the Building Industry Association of Washington, which backed Rossi, did contact his office in July 2005 to ask that Hastings urge the White House to fire McKay.

"I flat out refused to do so, which Ed Cassidy told him in the bluntest of terms," Hastings said."

Under further questioning from the Senate Judiciary Committee, McKay said that after he received the phone call from Cassidy, he quickly alerted Jeffrey Sullivan, who was then the head of the criminal division in McKay's office, and Mark Bartlett, the first assistant U.S. Attorney for the Western District of Washington.

McKay told Sullivan and Bartlett about the call, but he said the three of them collectively decided to take no further action because he felt he had stopped Cassidy short of making any improper requests.

Cassidy joined the office of Republican Minority Majority Leader John Boehner in February, as his senior advisor and floor assistant.

He advises Boehner on congressional ethics, election law, campaign finance reform and issues related to the rules and organization of Congress.

In early 2005, Republican leaders changed the chamber's rules in response to an admonishment of former Republican Majority Leader Tom DeLay by the ethics committee. They made it more difficult to initiate and complete ethics investigations, and punish suspected offenders.

They also ousted the Chairman, Joel Hefley of Colo., who had led the ethics panel to admonish DeLay three times.

House Speaker Dennis Hastert gave the chairmanship of the Ethics Committee to one of his loyalists, Rep. Hastings.

But Hastings, who was not used to public attention, and had not held a news conference during 10 years in office in D.C., immediately created further controversy: He fired the panel's staff director and attempted to replace him with Ed Cassidy, a longtime partisan political player, who had been chief of staff in his office for 10 years.

That caused a three-month standoff in the Ethics Committee. Democrats objected to Cassidy because of his role as a GOP activist, and because he was not an attorney like all the key investigators in Ethics.

Because of the Ethics Committee's unique bipartisan structure, the Democrats refused to allow the committee to organize. Hastings eventually relented and hired William O'Reilly, an anti-trust lawyer, to manage the panel's lawyers.

But he added Cassidy to the Ethics Committee's staff in a different role.

Later, Hefley himself criticized his party in this episode.

"If I had been the ranking member and the majority party tried to put a partisan chief of staff in as the staff director for the Ethics Committee, in contradiction to the standards of a nonpartisan staff, I would have had to react, just as (the Democratic leader) did," Hefley told The Hill newspaper, which covers Congress and its members.

The Senate Judiciary hearing is ongoing. When McKay and three other former U.S. Attorneys complete their testimony before the panel, they will testify this afternoon before the House Judiciary Committee.

McKay Goes Down Fighting (SEATIMES)

By David Bowermaster And Alicia Mundy, Seattle Times staff reporters

The Seattle Times, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON — John McKay insists he did not want to talk publicly about his abrupt dismissal as U.S. Attorney for the Western District of Washington in December.

But when he testified before two congressional committees on Tuesday, McKay delivered a vigorous defense of his work and the performance of his office. He challenged the Justice Department's shifting explanations about why he was asked to resign.

He revealed that soon after the hotly contested 2004 governor's race in Washington state, the chief of staff to Rep. Doc Hastings, R-Pasco, called him to ask about the status of any federal investigations into voter fraud.

He even suggested after Tuesday's hearings that bitterness over his refusal to pursue the fraud allegations played a part in his failure to win a federal judgeship.

Yet once the TV lights were off and the drama had ended for the day, it was still hard to identify exactly why the Department of Justice had fired McKay and seven other U.S. attorneys in December, let alone to determine whether the firings were justified.

McKay joined five other former U.S. attorneys testifying under subpoena in a pair of hearings on Capitol Hill, all of them sharing their disbelief and frustration over how their government careers were abruptly ended.

The prosecutors said they could see no clear reason why they were let go other than political motives, noting that supervisors in Washington, D.C., had praised their work and given them glowing performance evaluations since President Bush took office in 2001.

One of them, Carol Lam of San Diego, successfully prosecuted former U.S. Rep. Randy "Duke" Cunningham, R-Calif., and yet was dismissed shortly after indicting two of his partners in a sweeping bribery case.

New Mexico's David Iglesias told lawmakers he felt pressed by Sen. Pete Domenici, R-N.M., last October to rush indictments against Democrats before Election Day in November.

Arkansas' Bud Cummins wrote other fired prosecutors in an e-mail last month of a "message" conveyed by a Justice Department official that if they continued to talk with news reporters, the agency "would feel forced to somehow pull their gloves off" and fight back.

"The department stands by the decisions" to fire the eight prosecutors, William E. Moschella, principal associate deputy attorney general, told the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law.

"To be clear," he said, "it was for reasons related to policy, priorities and management that these U.S. attorneys were asked to resign."

Senate and House Democrats were not satisfied and pledged to continue to investigate the firings.

Call from Hastings aide

The spotlight fell on McKay early in the day, during the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing, when Sen. Dianne Feinstein, D-Calif., asked him if he had ever been contacted by any members of Congress about ongoing investigations.

McKay responded that "some weeks" after the 2004 election, after a third recount had determined that Democrat Christine Gregoire had narrowly defeated Republican Dino Rossi in the governor's race, Ed Cassidy, Rep. Hastings' then-chief of staff, called McKay.

"I was told the purpose of the call was to inquire on behalf of Congressman Hastings" about the status of ongoing investigations of voter fraud, McKay said.

McKay said he was "concerned and dismayed by the call," given Cassidy's job and the sensitivity of the election.

McKay said he informed Cassidy that his office had already asked the public to contact the FBI with any evidence of voter fraud, so it could be investigated.

Cassidy then began to ask McKay whether any future action would be taken by the U.S. Attorney's Office with regard to the governor's race.

"When Mr. Cassidy called me on future action, I stopped him and I told him I was sure that he wasn't asking me on behalf" of Hastings, McKay told the Senate committee, "because we both knew that would be improper. [Cassidy] agreed it would be improper, and he ended the conversation in a most expeditious manner."

McKay said he didn't pursue the fraud allegations because there was no evidence to support them.

Cassidy is now a senior adviser to House Minority Leader John Boehner, R-Ohio, and, among other things, advises Boehner on congressional ethics.

Hastings chaired the House Ethics Committee from February 2005 until Democrats took control of the House earlier this year. He's now the ranking Republican on the committee.

Cassidy said in a statement Tuesday that his conversation with McKay "was a routine effort to determine whether allegations of voter fraud in the 2004 gubernatorial election were, or were not, being investigated by federal authorities."

He said he understood the ethical boundaries of such a conversation and didn't violate them. Congressional rules prohibit House and Senate members from discussing ongoing investigations with federal prosecutors.

Hastings, in a statement also issued Tuesday, called Cassidy's conversation with McKay "entirely appropriate."

"It was a simple inquiry and nothing more — and it was the only call to any federal official from my office on this subject either during or after the recount ordeal," Hastings said.

Hastings said Tom McCabe, executive vice president of the Building Industry Association of Washington, which backed Rossi, contacted his office in July 2005 to ask that Hastings urge the White House to fire McKay.

"I flat-out refused to do so, which Ed Cassidy told him in the bluntest of terms," Hastings said.

Brian Roehrkasse, a Justice Department official, strongly denied that McKay's handling of the 2004 governor's race had anything to do with his dismissal.

"Absolutely not," Roehrkasse said. "Any suggestion to that effect is flatly false."

Nonetheless, while talking to reporters after the hearing, McKay implied that Republican unhappiness with the 2004 election might also have scuttled his chances to become a federal judge.

Pursuit of judgeship

DOJ_NMG_0141428

When U.S. District Judge John Coughenour took senior status in July, it opened a seat on the bench in the Western District of Washington.

McKay said at the time that he was interested in the job and had applied.

He said Tuesday that during interviews with Harriet Miers, former White House counsel, and William Kelley, deputy counsel, he was asked to explain "criticism that I mishandled the 2004 governor's election."

McKay further implied that Hastings was the source of the criticisms to the White House.

"I think that you should ask Congressman Hastings if he contacted the White House in connection with my application to be district judge or contacted the justice department," McKay said.

Todd Young, Hastings' chief of staff, said that as the senior Republican in Congress from Washington state, Hastings and Democratic Sen. Patty Murray jointly oversaw a panel that picked candidates to fill recent judicial vacancies in Tacoma and Seattle. Consequently, Young said, Hastings had regular contact with the White House about judgeships.

But, Hastings said in a statement: "Neither I nor any member of my staff — past or present — ever contacted anyone at the White House or the Department of Justice about whether John McKay should be removed as U.S. attorney or whether he was qualified to be a federal judge."

Moschella, the associate deputy attorney general, appeared before the House Judiciary Committee to explain the Justice Department's reasons for the dismissals.

Discussing McKay, Moschella noted that sentences meted out in the Western District of Washington were among the lightest in the nation.

"We need to do our part to ensure we get the maximum number within the sentencing guidelines," Moschella said. "That was certainly a consideration."

McKay countered at the hearing that federal judges, not prosecutors, are responsible for sentencing defendants.

A Justice Department official added after the hearing that the agency also felt McKay's office too rarely appealed light sentences.

Moschella also noted that McKay was a "vigorous and strong proponent of a particular information-sharing system called LINX."

Though many local law-enforcement officials and the U.S. Navy praised McKay's work on LINX, Moschella said Justice Department headquarters "had a difference" with McKay about the program.

Moschella did not clarify the exact nature of the difference between headquarters and McKay over LINX, but a Justice Department official said after the hearing that Deputy Attorney General John McNulty in late 2006 was pushing for an alternative communications system known as OneDOJ.

"You can't have multiple information-sharing systems," the official said.

McKay said he had never heard previously that LINX or sentencing concerns were the reasons for his dismissal.

"I accept what they said today," McKay said after the hearings. "I wonder what they're going to say tomorrow."

Mundy reported from Washington, D.C.; Bowermaster reported from Seattle. Reporter Mike Carter and the Los Angeles Times and Associated Press contributed to this report.

Charge Hits Ex-Ethics Aide (RC)

By Rachel Van Dongen

Roll Call, March 7, 2007

Accusations against a former top aide to Rep. Doc Hastings (R-Wash.) throw a new wrinkle into any investigation flowing from the dramatic testimony of a former U.S. attorney that implicates two sitting lawmakers — and could force Hastings, the top Republican on the ethics committee, to recuse himself from such a probe.

John McKay, the fired U.S. attorney for Washington state, on Tuesday accused former ethics panel aide Ed Cassidy of calling him to ask about the status of a potential federal probe into the long-contested 2004 Washington gubernatorial race.

At the time of the inquiry, Cassidy was Hastings' chief of staff in his personal office, but he went on to become Hastings' top aide on the ethics panel in February 2005.

The accusations were leveled at a sensational Senate Judiciary Committee hearing Tuesday morning, during which four ousted U.S. attorneys testified that they did not know why they were summarily fired by the Justice Department. At the hearing, fired New Mexico U.S. Attorney David Iglesias accused Sen. Pete Domenici (R-N.M.) and Rep. Heather Wilson (R-N.M.) of pressuring him into wrapping up a corruption probe into local Democrats.

The House and Senate ethics committees could open probes into the lawmakers' behavior.

DOJ_NMG_0141429

"I believe the House ought to take it under consideration," said House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer (D-Md.). "Am I going to file a complaint? The answer is no. It has been my consistent position that the ethics committee has a responsibility ... when issues are raised in the public sphere ... I would hope they would do that."

A Hastings spokeswoman would not comment Tuesday on whether the Republican would recuse himself from any probe into the U.S. attorneys' allegations.

"Ed Cassidy's call and the conversation that took place were entirely appropriate," Hastings said in a written response to questions from Roll Call. "It was simply an inquiry and nothing more — and it was the only call to any federal official from this office on this subject either during or after the recount ordeal."

"If McKay was truly dismayed at the time about Ed Cassidy's call, I simply cannot understand why he didn't just pick up the phone to make me aware of his concern about my aide's call," Hastings continued.

In his testimony before the Judiciary Committee, McKay said he was "concerned" and "dismayed" by a call from Cassidy a few weeks after the November 2004 elections.

McKay testified that Cassidy called him to "inquire on behalf of the Congressman" about the status of any federal probe into voter fraud. McKay said he reminded Cassidy that he was certain he was not asking him to "reveal information" about the status of a probe or "lobby me on one."

"He agreed that it would be improper and ended the conversation in a most expeditious fashion," McKay said, explaining that he then summoned his top staffers to discuss the troublesome phone call. "We all agreed that I stopped Mr. Cassidy before he entered clearly inappropriate territory and that it was not necessary to take the matter any further."

Now a top aide to House Minority Leader John Boehner (R-Ohio), Cassidy released a statement Tuesday in which he agreed that he contacted McKay, but denied that anything improper was said.

"My conversation with John McKay was a routine effort to determine whether allegations of voter fraud in the 2004 gubernatorial election were, or were not, being investigated by federal authorities," Cassidy stated. "I am pleased that Mr. McKay recalls both our agreement to respect these boundaries and my subsequent decision to end the conversation promptly."

In a statement released late Tuesday, Boehner said that both Cassidy and McKay had made it "abundantly clear" that no "impropriety" took place during their conversation.

The dustup involving the top Congressional staffer was just one subplot in the complicated drama surrounding the ousted U.S. attorneys.

Iglesias, McKay, Bud Cummins III, the former U.S. attorney for Eastern Arkansas, and Carol Lam, the ousted U.S. attorney for the Southern district of California, all testified before the House and Senate Judiciary Committee on Tuesday.

The most charged allegations stemmed from Iglesias, who claimed that he felt "pressured" and "leaned on" during an "unprecedented" call to his home by Domenici at the end of October 2006.

Iglesias said that Domenici asked him whether specific indictments in the corruption probe would be "filed before November." When Iglesias replied in the negative, he testified that the Senator said, "I'm very sorry to hear that" and that the phone line abruptly went dead.

"I felt sick afterwards. I felt that he was upset at hearing the answer that he received," Iglesias testified. "I felt leaned-on, I felt pressure to get these matters moving."

Iglesias also detailed a similar phone call from Wilson on about Oct. 16, 2006, in which Wilson, he testified, inquired about "sealed indictments."

"Red flags went up in my head ... we cannot talk about a sealed indictment," Iglesias said. "I was evasive and nonresponsive to her question."

"She was not happy with that answer," Iglesias added.

Iglesias' testimony conflicts with statements released Sunday and Monday, respectively, by Domenici and Wilson.

In her statement, Wilson said that a constituent "with knowledge of ongoing investigations" told her in the fall that Iglesias was "intentionally delaying corruption prosecutions."

Wilson called that allegation "deeply troubling" and said she called Iglesias directly to clarify the situation.

"My call was not about any particular case or person, nor was it motivated by politics or partisanship," Wilson said. "I did not ask about the timing of any indictments and I did not tell Mr. Iglesias what course of action I thought he should take or pressure him in any way.

"If the purpose of my call has somehow been misperceived, I am sorry for any confusion," she added. "I thought it was important for Mr. Iglesias to receive this information and, if necessary, have the opportunity to clear his name."

In his statement, Domenici apologized for contacting Iglesias, but maintained he did nothing improper.

"At no time in that conversation or any other conversation with Mr. Iglesias did I ever tell him what course of action I thought he should take on any legal matter," Domenici said. "I have never pressured him nor threatened him in any way."

Jennifer Yachnin contributed to this report.

Attorneys Scandal Endangers Wilson (POLITICO)

By By: Josh Kraushaar And Patrick O'Connor

Politico, March 7, 2007

Rep. Heather Wilson has long been among the most vulnerable Republicans in Congress, eking out wins in a Democratic-leaning New Mexico district because of her independent reputation and persistent campaigning.

She now faces a new challenge to her future as well as her reputation: involvement in a growing political tempest over the firings of eight U.S. attorneys by the Justice Department.

Wilson acknowledged Monday night that last October she contacted then-New Mexico U.S. Attorney David Iglesias to inquire about the pace of a corruption probe against the state treasurer, a Democrat. But she firmly denied calling to pressure Iglesias to speed the indictment process.

"My call was not about any particular case or person, nor was it motivated by politics or partisanship," Wilson said in a statement. "I did not ask about the timing of any indictments, and I did not tell Mr. Iglesias what course of action I thought he should take or pressure him in any way. The conversation was brief and professional."

Also in the statement, Wilson reiterated she had nothing to do with Iglesias' dismissal.

Iglesias testified in front of the Senate Judiciary Committee on Tuesday that in the Oct. 16 phone call, Wilson pressured him for details about sealed indictments.

"The second she said any question about sealed indictments, red flags went up in my head," Iglesias said. "We cannot talk about indictments until they're made public. We specifically cannot talk about a sealed indictment."

Democrats accuse the Bush administration of firing the prosecutors to make room for Republican allies and using a new provision of the Patriot Act to install new U.S. attorneys without going through the Senate confirmation process.

Attorney General Alberto Gonzales has denied that charge and said he intends to submit all of the names of his appointees to the Senate confirmation process. The potential political repercussions for Wilson are clear. Ethical miscues brought down several Republican incumbents last election and were a significant reason for the party's poor performance in the 2006 midterms. The liberal ethics watchdog Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics called on the House Ethics Committee to investigate whether Wilson's contact with Iglesias violated House rules. Federal law prohibits members of Congress from intervening in an active investigation.

"There are serious discrepancies that exist between Heather Wilson's statement today and Mr. Iglesias' testimony delivered under oath," said Doug Thornell, spokesman for the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee. "Ms. Wilson needs to fully explain those discrepancies."

House Minority Leader John Boehner (R-Ohio) dodged a question about whether the House should conduct an ethics investigation into Wilson's contact with the U.S. attorney, deferring to Iglesias and a statement released by Wilson's office on Tuesday morning.

"I'm not sure what the facts are in this case," Boehner said.

The allegations against Wilson represent a change of political circumstances for the nine-year congresswoman. During Wilson's 2006 reelection campaign, she attacked her Democratic opponent, Patricia Madrid, who was state attorney general at the time, for what she described as tolerating corruption in the state treasurer's office.

The homegrown scandal in many ways overshadowed Democratic charges that Wilson accepted money from former House Majority Leader Tom DeLay (R-Texas) and imprisoned former Rep. Randy "Duke" Cunningham (R-Calif.).

But that same scandal is now providing Democrats with ammunition that Wilson overstepped her bounds.

"Call it luck, call it savvy, she has avoided accountability thus far, and this could be the straw that broke the camel's back," said New Mexico Democratic Party Executive Director Matt Farrauto.

It also is once again making Wilson's reelection bid one of the more closely watched House campaigns for 2008. National Democrats have unsuccessfully targeted her in every cycle since her first election. She never has won more than 55 percent of the vote. In 2006, Wilson won reelection by fewer than 900 votes. But after her victory over Madrid in an otherwise tough year for Republicans, there was talk that she might earn an easier race in 2008.

The latest scandal, however, is only quickening the campaign process. State Democrats have named a handful of potential candidates against Wilson in 2008, including state Rep. Al Park, state Auditor Hector Balderas, Bernalillo County District Attorney Kari Brandenburg and Albuquerque mayoral candidate Eric Griego.

Wilson was also considered the Republicans' strongest candidate to run to succeed GOP Sen. Pete Domenici, if he retired. Domenici also acknowledged he contacted Iglesias during the investigation.

Iglesias told the Senate panel Tuesday that he felt "leaned on" and sickened as Domenici hung up on him in disgust last fall when told that indictments in the corruption case would not be issued before the fall elections.

With both Domenici and Wilson tainted from the allegations, Democrats may also have a newfound opportunity to compete for both a House and a Senate seat.

Wilson is one of only nine Republicans representing districts that Democrat John F. Kerry carried in the 2004 presidential election. During an interview last week, National Republican Congressional Committee (NRCC) Chairman Tom Cole of Oklahoma called her an "exceptional candidate" and said she "does everything right."

"The NRCC has every confidence in Heather Wilson as a candidate and a person. She has impeccable character," NRCC spokeswoman Julie Shutley said Tuesday.

Fired U.S. Attorney Accuses Republicans Of Exerting Political Pressure (LAW)

By Jason McLure And T. R. Goldman, Legal Times

Legal Times, March 7, 2007

New Mexico's former U.S. Attorney accused Sen. Pete Domenici, R-N.M., and Rep. Heather Wilson, R-N.M., Tuesday of exerting political pressure on him about an ongoing public-corruption investigation just before Election Day last fall.

David Iglesias, who was asked to resign from the Justice Department with at least six other U.S. Attorneys on Dec. 7, told members of the Senate Judiciary Committee that Wilson had telephoned him on Oct. 16, about three weeks before the elections, to inquire about the status of "sealed indictments" in a probe involving a Democratic state legislator.

When Iglesias told Wilson that he couldn't speak about the existence of sealed indictments, "She was not happy with that answer," he said, and their call ended a short time later.

Wilson was then in the middle of a heated re-election campaign against former New Mexico Attorney General Patricia Madrid. Wilson won the election over Madrid by fewer than 900 votes.

Justice Department guidelines strictly limit what prosecutors can say about ongoing investigations. Nonetheless, two weeks after Wilson's call, Iglesias testified that he received an unusual call from Domenici at his home in late October, just days before the November elections. The senator also wanted to know about the prospect of charges in the public-corruption case.

"Are these going to be unsealed by November?" Iglesias said Domenici told him.

Iglesias says that after he told Domenici it was unlikely charges would be brought before November, Domenici told him, "I'm very sorry to hear that," and the line went dead.

"I felt sick afterwards," Iglesias said. "I felt leaned on."

Asked why he did not immediately report the calls from Wilson and Domenici to his superiors at the Justice Department -- as mandated by internal Justice rules -- Iglesias said he felt torn between his loyalties to Domenici, whom he described as a mentor, and to Wilson, whom he said had been a friend. Domenici had supported Iglesias' nomination to become U.S. Attorney in 2001.

Iglesias suggested that his firing, given his office's high marks in internal Justice Department performance reviews, may have come as a result of Domenici or Wilson pressuring the White House or Justice to ask for his resignation.

"I suspect they felt I was not a help to them during the campaign," Iglesias said. After he was fired, he said, he "began to put the dots together."

In response to questions about her call with Iglesias, a spokeswoman for Wilson's office forwarded a statement saying she had contacted Iglesias' office after a constituent complained about the pace of ongoing corruption investigations. "I did not ask about the timing of any indictments, and I did not tell Mr. Iglesias what course of action I thought he should take or pressure him in any way," Wilson says in the statement. "If the purpose of my call has somehow been misperceived, I am sorry for any confusion."

Domenici's office did not return a call for this article. But earlier this week, The Washington Post reported that Domenici had complained about Iglesias to Attorney General Alberto Gonzales on three occasions in 2005 and 2006, and had spoken with Gonzales' top deputy last October.

The contacts by Domenici and Wilson could prove problematic. Ethics rules prohibit members of Congress from contacting federal officials involved in ongoing investigations. This week, a left-leaning public interest group asked the Senate Ethics Committee to investigate Domenici's contacts with Iglesias.

HOUSE CALL

Iglesias recounted his story during morning testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee, flanked by three other of the fired U.S. attorneys. All of them said that the Justice Department had not informed them why they had been fired. During the afternoon, the same four former prosecutors, as well as two others that had been asked to resign, were called before a House Judiciary subcommittee.

There, they were joined William Moschella, a top Justice Department official, who laid out the department's case for the firings.

Moschella, the Justice Department's principal deputy associate attorney general, acknowledged the dismissals were poorly executed. "In hindsight, it could have been handled better," Moschella said. "It would have been much better to address the relevant issues [with each U.S. Attorney] upfront."

Moschella said the firings for seven of the U.S. Attorneys were for reasons related to "policy, priorities and management -- what has been broadly stated as performance-related reasons."

He also called speculation that the firings were related to political pressure over various public-corruption investigations "dangerous, baseless and irresponsible."

After the subcommittee chairwoman, Rep. Linda Sanchez, D-Calif., asked the six testifying former U.S. Attorneys to waive any privacy concerns over the reasons for their firings, Moschella laid out the case against each one.

With respect to Carol Lam, the former U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of California, whose office had won a guilty plea from former Rep. Randy "Duke" Cunningham, R-Calif., in a major public-corruption case, Moschella noted a relatively low number of gun and immigration prosecutions. "On immigration, her numbers in a border district just didn't stack up," Moschella said. He added that Lam's office ranked 91 out of 93 districts in gun prosecutions. "These are high administration priorities, and we expect these priorities to be filled," he said.

John McKay, the former U.S. Attorney for the Western District of Washington, was criticized for "policy differences." Moschella said McKay spent a considerable amount of time pushing Justice to approve an unspecified system in his office.

Moschella told the committee that Daniel Bogden, former U.S. Attorney for Nevada, was simply not doing a good enough job. "There was a general sense in the department about Mr. Bogden, that given the importance of the district in Las Vegas ... we were interested in seeing a new vigor and new energy in the office to take it to a new level," Moschella said.

Moschella essentially delivered the same pronouncement about New Mexico's Iglesias, adding that Iglesias had delegated too much authority to his top assistant. "There was a general sense that the district was in need of greater leadership," Moschella said.

As for Paul Charlton, former U.S. Attorney for Arizona, had been fired for "policy reasons." Moschella cited Charlton's policy of taping interviews with FBI agents and an ongoing dispute over pursuing the death penalty in a case, an issue Moschella described as "non-delegable."

Those five attorneys were all asked to resign Dec. 7, along with two other prosecutors. Despite Moschella's criticisms, all five had received positive evaluations from the Justice Department during periodic performance reviews.

H.E. "Bud" Cummins III, U.S. Attorney for Arkansas, also testified at the hearing. Cummins had been asked to resign last summer, and Justice Department officials have said that Cummins' firing was not done for performance reasons, but to clear the position for J. Timothy Griffith, a former political aide to White House adviser Karl Rove.

Justice Admits U.S. Attorney Was Forced Out (WP)

By Eric Rich, Washington Post Staff Writer

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

The Justice Department acknowledged yesterday that Thomas M. DiBiagio, the Maryland U.S. attorney who stepped down early in 2005, was forced from office and did not, as he said at the time, decide on his own to leave for personal reasons.

But the department official who asked for his resignation dismissed DiBiagio's claim in a New York Times article yesterday that he was ousted because of political pressure over public corruption investigations into the administration of then-Gov. Robert L. Ehrlich Jr.

In fact, the Republican governor's chief legal counsel, Jervis Finney, twice contacted the Justice Department to argue in DiBiagio's behalf, said David Margolis, an associate deputy attorney general. Finney contacted the department in fall 2004, not long after DiBiagio drew a rebuke for ordering his subordinates to produce "front-page" indictments, Margolis said.

Finney, he said, "called me during this process, claiming that I was being too harsh on Tom and that Tom was being railroaded by a bunch of Democrats in the U.S. attorney's office."

Margolis said that he asked DiBiagio for his resignation because he had "lost confidence in his abilities" and that he was not aware at the time of any investigations involving the Ehrlich administration. "There were absolutely no political shenanigans," said Margolis, a 42-year department employee who oversees ethics matters.

DiBiagio, who did not return repeated calls for comment yesterday, said in 2004 that his decision to leave was driven by financial and family considerations. He told the Times that he was speaking out now because he saw similarities between his departure and the recent firings of eight U.S. attorneys.

DOJ_NMG_0141433

The Bush administration has said the eight prosecutors were told to leave, all but one for performance-related reasons. However, Democrats and others have suggested evermore pointedly that politics was behind many of the dismissals.

DiBiagio said several prominent Maryland Republicans -- the Times did not name them -- had pressed him to back away from inquiries on whether associates of the governor were improperly using money from gambling interests to promote the legalization of slot machines. He said he had reported one of those conversations to an FBI official as a threat.

DiBiagio said the Justice Department offered so little support that it became "impossible for me to stay."

"I believe it was that investigation that played an integral role in what was done to me," DiBiagio told the newspaper. "I clearly got the message that I had alienated my political sponsor and I would not have any political support to stay another term. Clearly, they wanted me to leave."

The claim is extraordinary in part because of the friendship that DiBiagio and Ehrlich once shared and because Ehrlich, while he was a Republican congressman, had played a key role in securing the prosecutor's post for him. In an interview yesterday, Ehrlich said DiBiagio's comments "really came out of left field."

The former governor denied trying to influence DiBiagio's investigations or seeking his removal. "To try to tie this to slots is just crazy," Ehrlich said, and he expressed amusement over the idea that he would have held enough sway with officials in Washington to have the federal prosecutor removed.

Ehrlich also noted that he was nearly alone in publicly defending DiBiagio in summer 2004, when Democrats were calling for his resignation and editorial boards were questioning his fitness for office. "I've known him for a long time, and I think he should be given the benefit of the doubt," Ehrlich told the Baltimore Sun at the time.

Yesterday, Ehrlich acknowledged that he was dissatisfied with DiBiagio's handling, before that, of a corruption case involving Edward Norris, who was then Ehrlich's state police superintendent. But, he added, "there was nothing we could or would do about it."

Of the gambling investigation, which was closed without producing charges, Ehrlich said he recalled that one of his aides received two federal grand jury subpoenas in summer 2004. Ehrlich said he was not concerned about the investigation, and that Finney produced documents in response. "Jervy handled it, and we literally never heard anything more about it -- that was it," he said.

The public confirmation that DiBiagio was forced out adds an important coda to a turbulent period for the office. Although DiBiagio frequently declared his credo to be "justice without fear or favor," critics accused him of partisanship. Democrats, in particular, cited an investigation by DiBiagio's office that focused on then-Lt. Gov. Kathleen Kennedy Townsend (D) at the height of a tight 2002 gubernatorial contest that she lost to Ehrlich, and a federal probe of the Baltimore City Council, whose members are Democrats.

He was rebuked in July 2004 for sending a memo urging his prosecutors to obtain "Three 'Front-Page' White Collar/Public Corruption Indictments" before Nov. 6, four days after the presidential election. Although DiBiagio has said the memo was taken out of context, he was told after it was publicized that he could bring no public corruption cases without high-level approval.

Yesterday, Margolis said the memo was damaging. "A reasonable person could have concluded that he was trying to affect the outcome of an election, and we just can't have that," he said.

Margolis said DiBiagio was asked to resign after a performance evaluation of his office conducted late that year. He said the review concluded that there were "management and morale issues" in the U.S attorney's office that were related to DiBiagio's "judgment and candor" as well as his temperament.

Ex-boss Disputes DiBiagio's Story (BSUN)

By Matthew Dolan, Andrew A. Green And Matthew Hay Brown, Sun reporters

The Baltimore Sun, March 7, 2007

Justice official who forced resignation says U.S. attorney for Md. was ousted on merits

The top Justice Department official who forced the resignation of then-U.S. Attorney for Maryland Thomas M. DiBiagio more than two years ago said yesterday that serious problems with the prosecutor's judgment and candor prompted the dismissal.

David Margolis, an associate deputy U.S. attorney general, rejected DiBiagio's assertions this week that his probe of corruption in the Ehrlich administration led to his dismissal. In fact, Margolis said, Jervis S. Finney, the top legal adviser to then-Gov. Robert L. Ehrlich Jr., had long defended DiBiagio's work.

Margolis said Finney called Justice Department officials in 2004 - once to request that DiBiagio's job be spared and again to prolong his tenure. Margolis noted that those would be odd requests from an administration that DiBiagio portrayed as worried about a looming federal investigation into its ties to gambling interests.

Finney could not be reached for comment last night.

"I'm 150 percent sure that we made the right decision with Tom," Margolis said. "I'm a million percent sure ... that it was done on the merits, whether you agree with it or not."

Margolis said DiBiagio's ouster was prompted in large measure by internal e-mail messages published by The Sun in July 2004, in which the prosecutor called for three "front-page" corruption indictments before Election Day. The gambling investigation never came up, according to Margolis.

In an interview published yesterday in The New York Times, DiBiagio compared his fate to that of eight U.S. attorneys from around the country who have been fired more recently.

DiBiagio did not return calls seeking comment yesterday.

Still, members of Congress, some who have criticized the recent dismissals as unwarranted and politically motivated, are now seeking answers about DiBiagio's departure in 2004.

"It is a story which may show inappropriate political pressure on the Baltimore attorney for pursuing an investigation related to gaming, which implicated subordinates of the governor," Sen. Arlen Spector, a Pennsylvania Republican, said yesterday at a hearing in Washington. "Or it may be explained in what the story refers to as his pressure tactics and performance rating. So there are a lot of nuances."

Sen. Benjamin L. Cardin, a Maryland Democrat and member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, called yesterday for an investigation into DiBiagio's firing.

"Anytime allegations arise that politics may have interfered in the prosecution of federal cases, we must take it seriously," Cardin said in a statement. He said he was "not familiar with the specific conditions surrounding" DiBiagio's departure.

When DiBiagio announced his resignation two years ago, he insisted that the departure was long planned, citing personal reasons. But in an opinion piece in The Sun a little more than a year later, DiBiagio wrote that he had been under constant pressure to aim low and look the other way from potentially corrupt officials.

"The pressure finally culminated in a threat that I would be 'hurt' if I continued," he wrote in January 2006.

In the first half of 2004, DiBiagio's office had subpoenaed records from top Ehrlich aides while pursuing allegations of improper influence by gambling interests.

Lawyers familiar with the investigation said it centered on Richard E. Hug, Ehrlich's chief campaign fundraiser, who solicited donations from horse racing and gambling interests for a nonprofit group, Citizens for Maryland's Future. The group planned to run ads supporting Ehrlich's initiative to legalize slot machines in Maryland. Hug has denied any wrongdoing.

But after the federal investigators began their probe, the donation effort was abandoned and the investigation was closed, according to prosecutors and attorneys involved.

In the Times article, DiBiagio added details, alleging a direct threat from Ehrlich's associates. If he pursued the investigations, he told the Times, "the practical impact was to intimidate my office and shut down the investigations."

He also told the FBI of the "threat" against him, the article said. Officials at the Justice Department said yesterday that they had no information about any formal complaint by DiBiagio.

In the end, hobbled by the political pressure, he decided to resign, DiBiagio said.

Ehrlich confirmed last year that the federal prosecutor had subpoenaed records from his communications director, Paul Schurick, and said that his office had cooperated. But there was no basis for the investigation, Ehrlich said in an interview yesterday.

"It was basically just a fishing expedition, I think," Ehrlich said.

Ehrlich's influence was largely responsible for the selection of DiBiagio, whom the governor had known since they were young lawyers. But the former governor said he tried to keep an arms-length relationship with him to avoid any appearance of impropriety.

That became increasingly difficult as DiBiagio began to alienate much of the state's political community, Ehrlich said. During DiBiagio's tenure, the Justice Department "was not exactly friendly to us," Ehrlich said, particularly in the prosecution of state police Superintendent Edward Norris for his actions while Baltimore police chief.

At the same time, Ehrlich said, he felt the need to defend the man he had recommended for the job.

"I was put in a very interesting position here," Ehrlich said. "He was doing things I didn't necessarily like, but I had a very high-stakes issue going on because I had to support him. He was my guy."

DiBiagio, who was nominated as U.S. Attorney for Maryland by President Bush in 2001, is now an attorney in the Washington and Baltimore offices of the law firm Beveridge & Diamond.

DiBiagio's supporters have long pointed to his office's prosecution of Norris and investment banker Nathan A. Chapman Jr. - issues first raised in articles by The Sun - as evidence of his success in rooting out public corruption.

Ehrlich said yesterday that he understands DiBiagio's desire to defend his legacy. By the time he left office, DiBiagio's staff was undermining him in the press, and officials around the state were "calling for his head," the former governor said.

But that doesn't make DiBiagio's allegations true, Ehrlich added. "Just putting two and two together, I think he's feeling a sense of frustration," Ehrlich said. "This was an opportunity to vent that when the Times called him."

Despite providing more details about the slots investigation, DiBiagio has never publicly identified the Ehrlich associates who allegedly pressured him.

Local defense attorney David B. Irwin, an Ehrlich ally who served on one of his judicial nominating committees, expressed empathy for DiBiagio's situation. Irwin said he had discussed the prosecutor's future before he left, suggesting the possibly of working for law firms in Baltimore or Washington.

But Irwin rejected the idea that political pressure from Ehrlich's camp forced DiBiagio out.

"He was an equal-opportunity subpoena-er," Irwin said, noting that DiBiagio's prosecutors had demanded documents in cases affecting both political parties.

Irwin said never talked to DiBiagio on behalf of Ehrlich about taking a judgeship - a carrot that DiBiagio told the Times that a lawyer close to the former governor had offered.

According to Margolis, the decision to remove DiBiagio came after prosecutors in his office told Justice Department investigators that DiBiagio's intemperate leadership made their lives unbearable.

Another controversial episode that raised questions about DiBiagio's candor focused on a statement DiBiagio made to the news media after the mysterious death in 2003 of one of his former assistant prosecutors, Jonathan P. Luna, who was found stabbed and drowned in a Pennsylvania creek.

Before she resigned, then-Assistant U.S. Attorney Lisa M. Griffin wrote in an e-mail to DiBiagio and other members of the staff that she was "deeply embarrassed to hear that you led the press to believe that Jonathan was not in jeopardy of losing his job. That wasn't so."

His most controversial move came in a series of internal e-mails published by The Sun in July 2004, in which DiBiagio called for three "front-page" corruption indictments before Election Day.

DiBiagio said at the time that he was simply pushing his staff to work harder, and said that his references to "front page" and November were not politically motivated, as some critics suggested.

But after the e-mail became public, the Justice Department issued a rare public reprimand to DiBiagio, saying that from then on, Washington would have to approve all Maryland corruption cases.

Margolis acknowledged the memo's role in DiBiagio's firing but declined yesterday to specify other reasons why DiBiagio was let go.

After DiBiagio's ouster, his replacement shut down some of his most prominent cases. Interim U.S. Attorney Allen F. Loucks dismissed the indictment against the former director of the governor's crime office, Stephen P. Amos, and ended the federal investigation of the Baltimore City Council's financial practices without charges.

Yesterday, William E. Moschella, the principal associate deputy attorney general, told a House Judiciary subcommittee that it was DiBiagio's attempts to time prosecutions to the election cycle that concerned his superiors.

"There were inappropriate e-mails and a staff meeting initiated by Mr. DiBiagio in which he specifically called for public corruption cases within a specific time frame," Moschella said. "It was so egregious that the deputy attorney general at the time ... had to write him a letter saying, 'You will not turn any more corruption cases without running it by me first."

Rep. Melvin Watt, a North Carolina Democrat and committee member, challenged Moschella.

"Wasn't it before the election of Governor Ehrlich, and he was trying to get a prosecution done ... before that election and you are saying that an instruction from the Department of Justice to him not to pursue an investigation and charges before the election is not related?" Watt asked.

"We didn't tell him not to pursue any specific case," Moschella responded. He said a subsequent review showed that DiBiagio's office "was in disarray, poorly managed," and that his staff "had extremely poor morale."

Justice Official: Policy Rifts Ousted Arizona U.S. Attorney (AZREP)

By Mike Madden, Washington Bureau

Arizona Republic, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON - The Bush administration forced out Arizona's top federal prosecutor because of policy disputes over taping FBI interviews and when to seek the death penalty, a U.S. Justice Department official told Congress on Tuesday.

Former U.S. Attorney Paul Charlton was one of eight federal prosecutors forced to resign in January, sparking a controversy over how and why they were ordered to leave office. Six of them testified Tuesday on Capitol Hill.

The administration at first said all were forced out because of "performance-related issues." Democrats have alleged political reasons for the moves. Several of the U.S. attorneys involved, including Charlton, had been investigating corruption cases against Republican lawmakers in their states. Justice officials deny any political motivation.

advertisement

"I would put Mr. Charlton more in the policy category," William Moschella, principal deputy associate attorney general, told the House Judiciary subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law.

U.S. attorneys are the top federal prosecutors in 94 court districts around the country. They serve at the pleasure of the president and can be hired or fired for any reason. But Congress is still conducting several inquiries into the circumstances surrounding January's moves.

All the prosecutors forced out were appointed by President Bush. Moschella acknowledged Tuesday that the administration hadn't told the prosecutors why they were forced out and conceded that may have helped stir the controversy.

"Although the department stands by the decision to ask these U.S. attorneys to resign, it would have been much better to have addressed the relevant issues up front with each of them," he said.

Charlton had served in Arizona from November 2001 until January. Officials told him in December that he had to resign.

He told the House panel that he had offered his resignation in 2006 over his insistence that the FBI tape interviews with suspects, which he called crucial to convicting child molesters. Justice officials instead persuaded him to request permission to make the taping part of a pilot program. They never responded to his request before he was told to resign.

"There is, in my mind, no small amount of irony in the Department of Justice having chosen that as the reason for asking me to resign," Charlton said.

Both Charlton and Moschella said officials in Washington objected to the taping policy because it might affect other federal law enforcement agencies and other U.S. attorneys offices. Charlton also wanted to decide whether to seek the death penalty on a case-by-case basis, clashing with administration officials who wanted the final say on when to push for executions.

As with several of the other prosecutors, Charlton was investigating politically sensitive issues just before last fall's elections. Prosecutors were investigating a land deal by Rep. Rick Renzi, R-Ariz., and a 1996 camping trip led by former Rep. Jim Kolbe, R-Ariz., that included teenage House pages. Both Renzi and Kolbe have denied wrongdoing, and officials haven't filed charges against either.

Charlton appeared before the House panel in response to a subpoena. He had declined to testify voluntarily at a Senate hearing on the matter earlier in the day.

Top Ariz. Prosecutor Fired Over Policy Clashes? (AZREP)

By Mike Madden, Republic Washington Bureau

The Arizona Republic, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON - The Bush administration forced out Arizona's former top federal prosecutor because of policy disputes over taping FBI interviews and when to seek the death penalty, a Justice Department official told Congress Tuesday.

Former U.S. Attorney Paul Charlton was one of eight federal prosecutors made to resign in January, sparking a controversy over how and why they were ordered to leave office. The administration at first said all were forced out due to "performance-related issues."

Democrats have alleged political motivations for the moves - several of the U.S. attorneys involved, including Charlton, had been investigating corruption charges against Republican lawmakers in their states.

"One troubling allegation is that certain of these U.S. attorneys were asked to resign because of actions they took or didn't take relating to public corruption cases," William Moschella, principal deputy associate attorney general, told the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law. "These charges are dangerous, baseless and irresponsible . . . I would put Mr. Charlton more in the policy category."

In Arizona, Charlton had insisted on taping FBI interviews that might be used in prosecutions, a policy that hadn't been cleared with officials in Washington who feared it would affect other federal law enforcement agencies and other states. He also wanted to decide whether to seek the death penalty on a case by case basis, clashing with administration officials who wanted a national policy to govern when to push for executions.

Charlton only appeared before the House panel Tuesday in response to a subpoena, declining to testify voluntarily at a Senate hearing on the matter earlier in the day.

"In most of our cases, we were given little or no information about the reason for the request for our resignations," Charlton and his former colleagues said in prepared testimony. "This hearing is not a forum to engage in speculation, and we decline to speculate about the reasons."

Cummins Testifies On His Firing (MCA)

By Bartholomew Sullivan Sullivanb@shns.com

Memphis Commercial Appeal, March 7, 2007

DOJ_NMG_0141437

WASHINGTON -- The former U.S. attorney for eastern Arkansas, H.E. "Bud" Cummins, told a House Judiciary subcommittee Tuesday that he told no one he didn't plan to serve out President Bush's term -- until after he'd been asked to resign last summer.

"When I started hinting that I might be moving on ... (that) was my attempt to be discreet and try to conceal the fact that they had handled it like they had handled it," Cummins said.

He was one of six former U.S. attorneys abruptly removed from office last year and subpoenaed Tuesday to address a growing perception that their firings were politically motivated.

Principal associate deputy Atty. Gen. William Moschella acknowledged Tuesday the terminations, which were made without explanation, "could have been handled better."

Cummins, who left office in December, was the chief federal prosecutor who handled the undercover investigation that led to corruption charges against West Memphis police officers and Crittenden County Sheriff's deputies in 2002.

Under questioning by U.S. Rep. Steve Cohen, D-Tenn., Cummins said he might have stayed silent after his ouster but couldn't after the Justice Department began citing performance deficiencies for the removal of other high-performing federal prosecutors. Moschella cited differences over policies and priorities for some of the firings in his testimony.

Like Cummins, former U.S. attorney Daniel Bogden of Nevada testified he had been told by a senior Justice official that he was being moved out to give another Republican nominee a resume-enhancing position.

Cummins was replaced by interim U.S. Atty. J. Timothy Griffin, an Iraqi war veteran and military prosecutor who had served briefly as an assistant U.S. attorney in Cummins' Little Rock office.

Griffin, 38, a protege of presidential adviser Karl Rove and a former Republican Party opposition researcher, has not been nominated by the president and has therefore not been subject to the Senate's advise-and-consent oversight. He has said he will not be a nominee for the permanent job.

The hearing was held to gather testimony from the fired prosecutors and to hear testimony on restoring provisions of the law regarding the installation of U.S. attorneys that now permits indefinite temporary appointments without Senate confirmation.

The law was a last-minute Justice Department insertion into the reauthorization of the U.S.A. Patriot Act.

Also testifying were Carol C. Lam of San Diego, who won the conviction of former GOP congressman Randy "Duke" Cunningham on corruption charges; David C. Iglesias of New Mexico; Paul K. Charlton of Arizona, and John McKay of the western district of Washington state.

While under questioning by Cohen, Cummins described a Feb. 20 conversation he'd had with Michael Elston, chief of staff to Deputy Atty. Gen. Paul McNulty, which Cummins said he shared with the former prosecutors.

Cummins suggested that Elston indicated some in the department were "irritated that some of us were responding to media inquiries." Cummins said he told him the issue was a matter between the Congress and the Justice Department.

"What I was trying to convince him of was that nobody at this (witness) table was driving this," Cummins said.

-- Bartholomew Sullivan: (202) 408-2726

Why were they fired?

Reasons given for asking some of the U.S. attorneys to resign, according to William Moschella, an associate deputy attorney general:

Carol Lam of San Diego: "Her gun prosecution numbers are at the bottom of the list."

John McKay of Seattle: "The department really had policy differences and were concerned with the manner in which he went about advocating the particular policies ..."

Daniel Bogden of Nevada: "There was no particular deficiency. There was an interest in seeing renewed energy and renewed vigor in that office, really taking it to the next level."

David Iglesias of New Mexico: " Mr. Iglesias had delegated to his first assistant the overall running of his office. U.S. attorneys are hired to run the office."

Sessions Says Firings Of Prosecutors Not Unusual (MONTADV)

By Ana Radelat, Montgomery Advertiser

Montgomery (AL) Advertiser, March 7, 2007

Sen. Jeff Sessions, a former U.S. attorney, said Tuesday there's nothing extraordinary about the firing of eight U.S. attorneys who clashed with Republican lawmakers or GOP policies.

"They're changed on a regular basis," Sessions, a Republican from Mobile, said of federal prosecutors. "And for the most part there was some disagreement between those United States attorneys and the policies of the president of the United States."

Six of the eight fired U.S. prosecutors testified Tuesday at House and Senate hearings that they were pressured by the Justice Department or Republican lawmakers -- including Sen. Pete Domenici, R-N.M.

"Sometimes United States attorneys who are not in sync with the goals of the Department of Justice need to be counseled and, at some point, (Justice officials) ought to find someone else who will follow those goals," Sessions said.

Sessions, a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, said he's never discussed a case with a U.S. attorney. He was a U.S. attorney himself in Alabama for 12 years before he was elected to the Senate.

Former New Mexico U.S. Attorney David Iglesias told members of the Senate Judiciary Committee on Tuesday that Domenici called him to ask whether indictments against local Democrats in a corruption investigation would be ready before Election Day. He said that when he told Domenici no, he was chilled to hear the senator say, "I'm very sorry to hear that" before hanging up.

Sessions conceded that Domenici's call to Iglesias was "an unwise thing to do" and said it was "a good learning experience" for all senators.

Domenici denied that he improperly pressured Iglesias.

Justice Department officials repeated their denials Tuesday that any of the prosecutors were improperly pressured or fired to make room for GOP political allies. They say most of the firings were performance-related.

Democrats say the firings prove the Bush administration has politicized the Justice Department.

Political Pressure Taints Firing Of Top Prosecutors (USAT)

USA Today, March 7, 2007

David Iglesias, until recently the top federal prosecutor in New Mexico, served as a model for the smart, fearless Navy defense lawyer played by Tom Cruise in the 1992 courtroom drama A Few Good Men.

On Tuesday, Iglesias starred in another drama, this one a real-life political saga that is threatening the reputation for independence of the nation's 93 U.S. attorneys.

Iglesias — one of seven U.S. attorneys fired Dec. 7 by the Justice Department — told a Senate panel that he was ousted after he refused to succumb to pressure from Sen. Pete Domenici and Rep. Heather Wilson, both New Mexico Republicans, to speed up a federal probe of local Democrats. Iglesias testified that Domenici called him at home last October and asked whether there would be indictments before the Nov. 7 elections. When Iglesias said no, Domenici said he was "sorry to hear that" and "the line went dead," according to Iglesias.

"I felt sick afterwards," Iglesias told the panel.

Queasiness is a justified reaction to congressional meddling with federal prosecutors and to the Bush administration's clumsy, unusual firings. Both deserve the close scrutiny they are beginning to get in Congress and the news media.

Though the nation's federal prosecutors are political appointees named by presidents, they've long been known for their independence. Their job is to bring civil and criminal cases for the federal government, without regard to politics. And many have done just that. In the early 1970s, a Richard Nixon appointee supervised the investigation that led to the resignation of Nixon's vice president, Spiro Agnew. Just two years ago, Bush appointee Carol Lam brought the case that sent former GOP congressman Randy "Duke" Cunningham to prison.

The recent firings undermine that image of independence. Lam, in fact, was one of the seven fired on Pearl Harbor Day. An eighth, Bud Cummins, of Arkansas, was let go last June.

Justice officials grudgingly acknowledged that Cummins was terminated to make way for Tim Griffin, a former aide to Bush adviser Karl Rove. As for the others, officials have gone from denying in January that the dismissals were political, to saying in February that six were "performance-related," to admitting last week that the White House approved the firings after Justice officials identified prosecutors who weren't carrying out administration law enforcement policies.

It's possible, of course, that some of the eight deserved to be replaced, but the shifting explanations raise serious doubts about the whole process. High-level appointments can't be completely insulated from politics, but one good step would be to return to a system, in place for many years, that gave the president the power to appoint U.S. attorneys and the Senate the power to confirm them. Last year, the Bush administration won a change that would give the attorney general more authority to appoint interim prosecutors to serve for unlimited periods without Senate confirmation. That's an invitation to trouble.

Historically, few U.S. attorneys have been dismissed by a president in the middle of their terms. That's a worthy precedent, one that inspires public confidence that the justice system is working properly and ensures that a few good men and women don't become victims of political vendettas.

A Few Angry Lawyers (SLATE)

By .Emily Bazelon

Slate.com, March 7, 2007

On Capitol Hill, the fired U.S. attorneys dish, and dish some more

DOJ_NMG_0141439

The Department of Justice can fire a U.S. attorney and expect him or her to go quietly. The federal prosecutors are appointed by the president, after all, and serve at his pleasure. But fire a bunch of them at once and start shredding their reputations—that's dangerous. Today, four of the Bush administration's formerly loyal U.S. attorneys showed up to testify before Congress and raised the lid on DOJ and Republicans in office. All sorts of things crawled out. And after years of living in one-party Washington—and logging hours at snoozer Republican-controlled committee hearings—I confess, it was a thrill to watch. Hooray for divided government!

David Iglesias, a former U.S. attorney from New Mexico, was the star witness at this morning's Senate hearing about the firing of eight—or now maybe nine—U.S. attorneys. Iglesias was square-jawed and resolute, so much so that Sen. Chuck Schumer, D-N.Y., didn't really need to mention that the former prosecutor and U.S. Navy lawyer is a partial model for the Tom Cruise character in A Few Good Men (though, of course, Schumer did). Iglesias gave an account of a phone call he received from Sen. Pete Domenici, Republican of New Mexico, before the November election:

1) Domenici called Iglesias in late October, at his house—the first time in 10 years as a prosecutor that he'd taken a call from a member of Congress on his home line.

2) The senator wanted to talk about a pending corruption investigation of government officials who just happened to be Democrats—an investigation that, Iglesias said, was a "huge battle" in Republican Rep. Heather Wilson's tight race for re-election. Domenici asked Iglesias, "Are these charges going to be filed before November?" Iglesias said he didn't think so.

3) Domenici responded, "I'm very sorry to hear that." And then the line went dead. Domenici had hung up on Iglesias. "I felt sick afterward," the former prosecutor said. "I felt leaned on. I felt pressure to get these matters moving."

Domenici has denied pressuring Iglesias. As for Wilson, she had called Iglesias two weeks earlier. She said this week that she asked Iglesias about allegations from a constituent that he "was intentionally delaying corruption prosecutions." Iglesias remembers otherwise. The phone call wasn't about allegations of a delay, he testified. Wilson "wanted to talk about sealed indictments" he might have had in the corruption case. Iglesias listened to her questions, and "red flags went up inside my head." It was as if Wilson had asked a government nuclear scientist "about secret launch codes."

If the calls from Domenici and Wilson were so alarming, why didn't Iglesias report them to DOJ? Sen. Arlen Specter, R-Pa., wanted to know. Ethical rules bar members of Congress from asking prosecutors about pending investigations, and DOJ guidelines apparently instruct prosecutors to report such contacts. Iglesias said he knew that but at the time felt "conflicted" about his competing loyalties. Pete Domenici was his longtime mentor. Heather Wilson was his longtime ally. He didn't want to turn on them.

"What made you change your mind?" Specter asked. It was the senator's least effective moment as the Bush administration's defender. "I've always been trained that loyalty is a two-way street," Iglesias answered. "I started thinking: Why am I protecting these people who not only did me wrong but did wrong to the system for appointing U.S. attorneys?"

Iglesias and the three other U.S. attorneys who appeared with him have taken pains to make clear that they didn't ask to testify. They waited to be subpoenaed by a subcommittee in the House of Representatives, which also heard their testimony today. The former USAs acknowledged that they served "at the pleasure of the president" and could be fired "at any time and for any reason." Except that, as far as they knew, no president had ever before fired a group of U.S. attorneys in the middle of his term. And "any reason" isn't supposed to include what felt to some of them like retaliation, after attempts to meddle with ongoing investigations. (John McKay, a former U.S. attorney from the western district of Washington, told a story like Iglesias's of a phone call from the former chief of staff of a Washington elected official, about a pending investigation relating to voter fraud.)

Nor did the ex-U.S. attorneys cotton to being threatened by DOJ—as they apparently were. H.E. "Bud" Cummins III, ex-U.S. attorney of the eastern district of Arkansas, brought to the hearing an e-mail he'd written to five of his fired compatriots on Feb. 20, two days after receiving a call from Mike Elston in the deputy attorney general's office. Cummins wrote that the essence of Elston's message was that DOJ "would feel forced to somehow pull their gloves off," if the fired U.S. attorneys continued to talk to the press or fuel a congressional investigation. "I was tempted to challenge him and say something movie-like such as 'are you threatening ME????'" Cummins wrote. Also, he wrote that Elston "reacted quite a bit to the idea of anyone voluntarily testifying [before Congress] and it seemed clear that they would see that as a major escalation of the conflict meriting some kind of unspecified form of retaliation."

This e-mail, which Schumer read gleefully into the record, did not sit well with the senators. At the start of the hearing, Specter had floated the idea that any effort to "threaten someone and stop them testifying" raised the specter of "obstruction of justice." As a basis for criminal charges, that's probably a stretch. Still, it all made for great theater.

DOJ_NMG_0141440

CORPORATE SCANDALS:

Companies Say Backdating Used In Days After 9/11 (WSJ)

By Mark Maremont, Charles Forelle And James Bandler

The Wall Street Journal, March 7, 2007

Amid the stock-market swoon that followed the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, dozens of companies granted stock options to top executives or other employees. Now, some of those companies are saying the grants were in fact made weeks later -- and backdated.

The disclosures are the latest wrinkle in a backdating scandal that involves more than 140 companies and has resulted in more than 70 firings or resignations of corporate officials. (See related article1.) The new information suggests some executives profited from the market's plunge following Sept. 11 by manipulating options grant dates.

Stock options give the recipient the right to buy shares at a set price, typically the stock's closing price on the day the options were granted. If the stock later rises, the recipient can cash in the option for a profit. The lower the exercise price, the greater the potential gain.

Backdating options involves looking for past low points for a stock, then pretending the options were granted on those favorable dates. The post-Sept. 11 period was an attractive time for backdaters. The market had its worst week in more than 60 years, then rebounded sharply in the fourth quarter.

At KLA-Tencor Corp., at least 11 top executives purportedly were awarded options on Oct. 2, 2001, at the very bottom of a sharp dip in the semiconductor-equipment maker's stock. But in a recent filing KLA said those options were among some that were improperly backdated, suggesting in a securities filing they weren't actually awarded until weeks later. The post-9/11 backdating increased KLA insiders' potential profit on the options by more than $12 million.

Affiliated Computer Services Inc., Take-Two Interactive Software Inc., Progress Software Corp. and Corinthian Colleges Inc. similarly have admitted they put erroneous dates on options that made it appear they were granted at post-9/11 low points.

Former officials at Monster Worldwide Inc. and Brocade Communications Systems Inc. have been accused by the Securities and Exchange Commission of backdating options to that period. The former Brocade official denies the allegations, and the ex-Monster executive has been in talks to settle the charges.

A number of other companies that have admitted to widespread backdating, including UnitedHealth Group Inc. and Broadcom Corp., also granted options dated in the post-Sept. 11 period. They haven't indicated whether those awards were backdated.

Harvey Pitt, who was chairman of the SEC at the time of the attacks, said it was "offensive" for companies to capitalize on the market panic caused by 9/11. The terror attacks "created many pressures, difficulties and dislocations," said Mr. Pitt. "The one thing it cannot be used to justify is the fraudulent backdating of documents."

In the wake of the attacks, the nation's stock markets were closed from Sept. 11 to Sept. 14. When they reopened the following week, the Dow Jones Industrial Average skidded more than 14%, in the worst full week for the blue-chip average since Germany invaded France in May 1940.

Scores of companies rushed to grant options during the market's trough; a Wall Street Journal analysis published in July found that among a set of 1,800 leading companies the frequency of option grants more than doubled in late September 2001, compared with other years.

When previously asked about their reasons for granting options in the wake of the terrorist attacks, some companies said it was pure happenstance, while others said it was intended to help motivate executives through the difficult period. But until recently none had admitted the award dates reflected improper backdating.

The post-Sept. 11 backdating has caught the attention of plaintiffs' lawyers. Some of them have already mentioned it in backdating-related lawsuits or say they plan to highlight the issue.

Joel H. Bernstein, an attorney at Labaton Sucharow & Rudoff LLP in New York, says that taking advantage of a national tragedy "is an emotional issue," but one that will "resonate very well with the judge and the jury." Mr. Bernstein's firm is involved in suing executives and directors at two of the companies that issued post-Sept. 11 options grants.

Post-Sept. 11 backdating also figured in two separate criminal cases filed last month in New York, in which a pair of former executives pleaded guilty to backdating-related offenses.

In one case, the former top lawyer for Monster admitted he helped orchestrate a years-long backdating scheme at the New York company, operator of the Monster.com job-search Web site. In a related civil complaint, the SEC charged that the ex-

DOJ_NMG_0141441

lawyer, Myron Olesnyckyj, helped award employees in one division a bunch of options that were backdated to Oct. 2, 2001, when the stock hit its lowest level in nearly two years.

That also was the day Monster announced it would have to scale back its earnings projections as a result of the terrorist attacks. Monster's then-CEO told investors that business activity had almost halted as companies "responded to help those in need" and "reflected on the tragedy." According to the SEC complaint, senior Monster executives didn't begin discussing the Oct. 2 grants until mid-October, when the company's stock was already recovering.

Andrew Levander, an outside lawyer for Monster, said the company has informed the government of any improprieties it has discovered.

At Take-Two, a New York-based videogame maker, former CEO Ryan A. Brant last month pleaded guilty to New York criminal charges and admitted to backdating numerous option grants to himself and subordinates to take advantage of prior stock dips. Although it wasn't specifically mentioned in the charges, one of the well-timed grants was originally dated Oct. 1, 2001, at the nadir of the stock's post-Sept. 11 plunge.

A spokesman for Take-Two says the company recently repriced the Oct. 1 grants along with a number of others as it corrected its books due to the widespread backdating. The spokesman says the company doesn't have sufficient information to know whether the wrongly dated Oct. 1 options were related to the Sept. 11 attacks, but he notes that Take-Two in October 2001 released a major new product, Grand Theft Auto III, the type of event for which it typically awards extra compensation.

KLA-Tencor, based in San Jose, Calif., was among the many that saw its stock battered by the terrorist attacks. On Sept. 10, KLA shares closed at $44.20. They began falling as soon as the markets reopened, and bottomed out on Oct. 2 at $29.31. By late October, the shares had rebounded to preattack levels.

The dip provided a tempting opportunity to backdate. KLA did so, issuing at least hundreds of thousands of options the company now says in securities filings were backdated. KLA recently repriced those options to $45.25, implying that they were really granted in late October when the shares next hit that level. KLA's chief executive at the time, Kenneth Schroeder, was by far the biggest beneficiary. He received a grant of 341,100 shares. The backdating added $5.4 million to his potential profit.

A KLA spokeswoman declined to comment, other than to note the Oct. 2 grant was given to a broad group of employees.

Mr. Schroeder stepped down as CEO in 2005 to take an advisory role with the company. He was fired last October in connection with the options scandal. A spokesman says Mr. Schroeder hasn't cashed out the post-9/11 grant for profit, and KLA says it has canceled the grant -- along with other backdated options Mr. Schroeder received -- outright. A spokesman for Mr. Schroeder said the company "rashly and unilaterally breached its contract with Ken."

Mr. Schroeder is fighting to get back the options, which would yield more than $2 million today, after the company's repricing.

Brocade, a data-storage networking firm based in San Jose, awarded employees a total of 8.9 million options dated Oct. 1, 2001. All six top executives of Brocade were given options with the favorable Oct. 1 date, including the then-CEO, Gregory L. Reyes, who himself received 1.3 million options. The stock quickly rebounded after the supposed grant date, rising to preattack levels by Oct. 5.

Last year, Mr. Reyes and another former top Brocade executive were charged by federal prosecutors in San Francisco with criminal offenses related to options backdating. In a related civil complaint, the SEC mentioned the post-Sept. 11 grant, charging Mr. Reyes with backdating options to employees to give them the beneficial Oct. 1, 2001 date, and also with having received backdated options bearing that same date.

In a separate civil complaint filed in San Francisco by shareholders suing Brocade, Mr. Reyes and four others, the plaintiffs noted that the depressed Oct. 1 stock price "resulted, in part, from the tragedy of Sept. 11th."

Richard Marmaro, an attorney for Mr. Reyes, said his client "never backdated any options," and any insinuation that he did so to take advantage of the post-Sept. 11 trough is "outrageous." After the attacks, Mr. Marmaro said, Mr. Reyes anonymously donated $1 million to a fund for the benefit of the New York City Fire Department. He also said that Mr. Reyes didn't set the dates of his own stock-option grants, which were the responsibility of a committee of board.

A Brocade spokeswoman declined to comment, except to note Brocade has offered to settle with the SEC.

Joseph W. Alsop, chief executive at another admitted backdater, Progress Software Corp., received options dated Oct. 10, 2001, to buy 125,000 shares of stock. Several other Progress executives also received hefty grants dated that Wednesday, when shares were down 16% from their pre-Sept. 11 levels. Two weeks later, shares of Progress were back up 25%.

A board-led investigation concluded late last year that Progress "generally selected the dates used as the grant dates retrospectively," often choosing the lowest closing price of the company's stock for the quarter. The Bedford, Mass., software concern said that the Oct. 10, 2001, grant was misdated, and should have been priced one-third higher, at $17.42. The stock next closed at that price on Dec. 4, suggesting that was the real award date. Mr. Alsop agreed to forfeit more than $5 million in options value for all of his misdated grants. He declined to comment.

DOJ_NMG_0141442

UnitedHealth Earnings Cut By $1.5 Billion For Past 12 Years (MINNST)

Minneapolis Star Tribune, March 7, 2007

Ending nearly a year of speculation about the long-term costs of a disputed stock-option program for senior executives, UnitedHealth Group announced Tuesday that it has reduced earnings by nearly $1.53 billion for the past 12 years.

By David Phelps, Star Tribune Ending nearly a year of speculation about the long-term costs of a disputed stock-option program for senior executives, UnitedHealth Group announced Tuesday that it has reduced earnings by nearly $1.53 billion for the past 12 years.

In addition, the company said it is making a $100 million payment to the Internal Revenue Service for back taxes on options that were backdated to give holders an advantageously low strike price that enabled them to profit handsomely when the options were cashed out.

The company also said it will take a $55 million cash charge for another set of options exercised in 2006 by non-officer employees.

"UnitedHealth is making a lot of progress by putting this behind them," said Rajesh Aggarwal, an associate professor of finance at the University of Minnesota's Carlson School of Management. "What was going on before was bad but they have the right strategy now."

The backdating controversy, which began last March, dogged the company throughout 2006 and eventually led to the resignation of CEO and Chairman William McGuire. The number two executive at the Minnetonka-based company, Stephen Hemsley, became CEO in December.

Wall Street reacted favorably to the financial restatement in part because it removed a cloud over UnitedHealth and because it signaled the start of a stock repurchase program by the company to increase shareholder valued.

In late morning trading, UnitedHealth's stock was up 84 cents a share to $53.80.

In its filing with the Securities and Exchange Commission, the company reported net earnings of $4.16 billion for 2006, an increase of 35 percent over 2005. Revenues rose from $46.43 billion to $71.54 billion reflecting, in part, the acquisition of PacifiCare in late 2005.

The company still faces a handful of shareholder lawsuits and investigations by the SEC, Justice Department and Minnesota Attorney General's office.

UnitedHealth Books Take Options Hit (WSJ)

By Vanessa Fuhrmans

The Wall Street Journal, March 7, 2007

UnitedHealth Group Inc. took a big step toward cleaning up its accounting mess by announcing a $1.13 billion reduction in previous earnings over a 12-year period. But the health-care giant still faces a thicket of legal uncertainty stemming from irregularities in how it granted and accounted for employee stock options.

The company's restatement, filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission yesterday, was in line with its earlier estimates and marks a major milestone in its efforts to resolve the options-backdating scandal that last fall claimed its longtime chief executive, William McGuire.

UnitedHealth still faces regulatory and criminal investigations into its past options-granting practices, as well as a number of shareholder lawsuits. But after months of delays, the SEC filing signaled that the health insurer's new management team finally has a firm idea of what taxes, fines and accounting costs will emerge from those probes. The SEC wouldn't comment on the matter, but the company has said that it has been cooperating with the agency.

"It's not exactly the end of the road," said Matthew Borsch, analyst at Goldman Sachs, "but we can virtually rule out a worst-case scenario."

The health insurer, based in Minnetonka, Minn., is one of the largest of more than 140 companies that have come under scrutiny in the past year for the possible backdating of stock options. The practice involves retroactively dating stock options to days with low share prices, potentially increasing their value. While doing so isn't illegal in itself, companies are required to disclose it and account for it as compensation. Dr. McGuire was forced to leave the company after a board-commissioned review concluded that options were likely backdated on his watch.

In its SEC filing yesterday, UnitedHealth stated that it had "used incorrect measurement dates and made other errors...in accounting for stock option grants." The company said it had found incorrect dates for grants involving roughly 80 million shares given to top company officers, about 260 million shares granted to senior and middle management and another 50 million shares tied to hiring or promoting other employees.

DOJ_NMG_0141443

Based on UnitedHealth's historical accounting method -- in effect until the start of 2006 -- the resulting changes in stock-based compensation lowered earnings by a total $1.13 billion.

UnitedHealth added it would make cash payments for additional corporate income taxes of roughly $100 million. It also will record an after-tax charge of $55 million, or four cents a share, in the first quarter of this year for a tax settlement related to some nonofficer employees who exercised options in 2006.

According to the restatement, the company's 2006 net income rose 35% to $4.16 billion from $3.08 billion. Revenue jumped 54% -- largely because of its recent acquisition of PacifiCare Health Systems Inc. -- to $71.54 billion.

Shares in UnitedHealth rose as much as 3% before closing up 1.9%, or $1.02, at $53.98 in 4 p.m. New York Stock Exchange composite trading.

The company also faces several shareholder lawsuits and is still assessing whether UnitedHealth itself has claims against Dr. McGuire or any board members in connection to the options scandal.

Write to Vanessa Fuhrmans at vanessa.fuhrmans@wsj.com3

UnitedHealth Cuts $1.5B From Profits (AP)

By Joshua Freed

AP, March 7, 2007

MINNEAPOLIS - Insurer UnitedHealth Group lopped as much as $1.5 billion off its historical earnings as it finished its accounting for backdated stock options on Tuesday.

The restatement, which was in line with the company's earlier estimates, removed much of the uncertainty that has hung over the nation's second-largest health insurer over the past year. But other questions remained, including whether the Internal Revenue Service would agree with UnitedHealth about the tax bill, and whether it would owe penalties.

The company also faces a formal investigation by the Securities and Exchange Commission and a review by the U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York.

UnitedHealth Group Inc. said it will make cash payments for additional corporate income taxes of about $100 million, and will record a charge of $55 million, or 4 cents per share, in the first quarter of 2007 for a settlement relating to some employees who exercised options in 2006.

But there's no guarantee the tax agency will agree with UnitedHealth's accounting, said CRT Capital analyst Sheryl R. Skolnick, and "I have to think that they probably will assess fines and interest."

Still, she said investors had good reason to believe some of the worst was over.

"From a company operating perspective, I think most of the extremely disruptive issues are done," she said.

An external report paid for by UnitedHealth had already found that many of the stock options it issued during the 1990s were probably backdated - giving the recipient an instant profit and creating the tax and accounting problems that the company is only now sorting out. On Tuesday the company acknowledged that it "used incorrect measurement dates and made other errors . . . in accounting for stock option grants."

The scandal led former Chairman and Chief Executive William McGuire to step down late last year. More than 200 companies have disclosed SEC, Department of Justice, or internal probes into stock options granting practices, according to an Associated Press review.

On Tuesday, UnitedHealth said correcting the stock options accounting would cut $1.53 billion off its earnings from 1994 to the end of 2005 under the method of accounting it used at that time. (After taxes, the cost would drop to $1.13 billion.) Under its current method of accounting, the options expense would hurt historical earnings by $502 million before taxes, or $414 million after taxes.

The restatement included after-tax charges of $238 million for 2005, $158 million for 2004, and $738 million for 2003 and prior years under the method of accounting the company used at the time.

The company said it would resume share repurchases. It had more than $1.9 billion in cash at the end of 2006 and it has board authorization to repurchase up to 137 million shares.

"Most investors will be relieved to see the company done with this," Bank of America analyst Joseph France said in a note to investors.

UnitedHealth shares rose $1.02, or 1.9 percent, to close at $53.98 on the New York Stock Exchange. That brings them nearly back where they were before the options problems surfaced, after dipping as low as $42 in late May.

In the future, France wrote, "Success will be increasingly determined by sales to individuals and smaller groups, rather than the large groups that have been key to the company's growth in the past."

UnitedHealth held back on acquisitions during the past year. Skolnick said it wasn't necessarily by choice.

DOJ_NMG_0141444

"The company never stopped being in the acquisition business, it's just that I don't know anyone who would have taken their stock as currency until the re-filing was done," she said.

SEC Fines Ex-Monsanto Executive For Indonesian Bribe (Update3) (BLOOM)

By David Scheer

Bloomberg, March 7, 2007

March 6 (Bloomberg) -- A former executive at Monsanto Co., the world's biggest developer of genetically modified crops, was fined $30,000 for bribing an Indonesian official in an unsuccessful bid to repeal an environmental rule, the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission said.

Charles M. Martin, Monsanto's former government affairs director in Asia, violated the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act in 2002 when he told a consultant to pay a senior Indonesian environmental official $50,000, the SEC said today. Martin arranged to book the bribe as part of the consultant's fee.

Monsanto paid $1.5 million in settlements with the SEC and the U.S. Department of Justice in 2005 for the bribe and other questionable payments in Indonesia. The St. Louis-based company sought repeal of a rule requiring it to assess environmental impact before planting genetically modified cottonseed, the SEC said. Even after the bribe, the official didn't change the law.

``The Foreign Corrupt Practices Act remains a significant part of our enforcement program, and we certainly intend to pursue not only entities but individuals," Christopher Conte, an SEC official overseeing the case, said in an interview.

In fining Monsanto in 2005, the SEC said the company's Indonesian affiliates also made at least $700,000 in illicit payments to at least 140 current and former Indonesian officials and their families. The payments were partially financed through unauthorized, improperly documented, and inflated sales of Monsanto's pesticide products in the country.

Martin neither admitted nor denied the accusations in agreeing to settle the SEC's civil lawsuit, filed at U.S. District Court in Washington today, the SEC said. His attorney, Richard Scheff in Philadelphia, didn't return a phone message seeking comment.

Monsanto resolved its part of the case more than two years ago, and today's action ``is strictly between the individual and the SEC," company spokeswoman Lori Fisher said.

The case is SEC v. Martin, No. 07-CV-434, U.S. District Court, Washington D.C.

Deal For Reliant Energy Admits No Guilt In Fraud Case (LAW)

By Justin Scheck, The Recorder

California Recorder, March 7, 2007

There's a group of very happy defense lawyers in San Francisco right now.

On Tuesday, nearly three years after then-U.S. Attorney General John Ashcroft announced on TV that an energy company had been charged with conspiring to jack up electricity prices during California's 2001 power crisis, the case ended with a set of deferred prosecution agreements.

The deals will dismiss charges against Reliant Energy and four of its traders, provided they stay out of trouble for the next two years. The company will also have to pay a $22.2 million fine.

"Obviously, we're extremely pleased with the result," said William Goodman, a partner at Topel & Goodman in San Francisco, who represents the company.

While the energy defendants won't get the penalties the government had sought, including prison time for the traders, freeing up four prosecutors will allow the San Francisco U.S. Attorney's Office to focus more attention on probes of tech companies like Apple Computer, which have been cooperating in options investigations for months.

Reached late Tuesday, defense lawyers and a spokesman for the prosecutors said they wouldn't comment until Northern District of California Chief Judge Vaughn Walker finalized the deal, nor would they discuss details of the arrangement. In general, non-prosecution agreements involving a company require that it pay a fine, but do not make it admit to criminal liability.

When it was first charged, the case was widely assumed to be something of a slam dunk, since prosecutors had audio tapes of Reliant traders talking about how they had shut down four of the company's five California plants to limit supply and boost their profits.

But the case also had obvious peculiarities, most notably the fact that the defendants were the first people to face criminal charges under a 70-year-old commodities regulation statute.

Once defense lawyers were able to persuade Walker to take the case from another judge -- which he was able to do because he had related energy crisis litigation -- things really started heading downhill for the government.

In 2005, Walker, excluded a key piece of the government's regulatory evidence from the case and issued a set of proposed jury instructions that created a high bar for the government to prove fraud.

DOJ_NMG_0141445

By then the prosecutors who charged the case had already left for private practice, and then-U.S. Attorney Kevin Ryan was forced to assemble a new team.

They appealed Walker's pretrial rulings to the 9th Circuit on the eve of trial in late 2005, upsetting the judge, who already had requested that a jury pool be assembled.

But the appeal didn't work in the prosecutors' favor. A three-judge panel didn't get to the substance of their claims, and it remanded the case back to Walker.

Since then, four prosecutors -- including two section chiefs, Michael Wang and Jonathan Schmidt -- have been occupied with preparing the case for trial.

That's sent ripples across an office where the white-collar corps is already stretched thin by dozens of high-profile stock option investigations and other already indicted fraud cases.

In addition to Goodman, Reliant was represented by William Jeffress Jr. of Baker Botts in Washington, D.C. George Cotsirilos Jr. of Cotsirilos & Campisano in San Francisco represented trader Jackie Thomas; and Mary McNamara of the San Francisco firm Swanson & McNamara represented another trader, V. Reginald Howard II.

Trader Lisa Flowers was represented by Nanci Clarence of San Francisco's Clarence & Dyer. John Williams, of Manchester, Williams & Seibert in San Jose, represented trader J. Kevin Frankeny.

Wal-Mart Fires Employee For Electronic Snooping (LAT)

By Abigail Goldman And Michelle Quinn

The Los Angeles Times, March 7, 2007

Wal-Mart Stores Inc. said Monday it had fired an employee for recording phone calls between its public-relations staff and a newspaper reporter and for intercepting text messages.

Wal-Mart said the employee was acting alone. It was the latest incident involving snooping on reporters by employees of companies they cover.

In this case, the retailer said an unnamed computer-systems technician was not authorized by the company to seek or obtain the information. The company also said it fired one manager and disciplined another for "failure to carry out their management duties."

Wal-Mart said that between September 2006 and January 2007, the technician recorded calls with Michael Barbaro, who writes about Wal-Mart for The New York Times. Over the previous year, The Times was printing stories of the company's personnel policies, based on leaked employee memos.

The company said the same employee also intercepted text messages using equipment that searched for key words in messages sent within a several-mile radius of Wal-Mart's Bentonville, Ark., headquarters.

"The company believes that these pager intercepts and the recordings of these telephone calls were wrong and has taken a number of actions to further strengthen our policies and controls," Wal-Mart spokeswoman Mona Williams said in a statement.

A spokeswoman for the U.S. Attorney's office for the Western District of Arkansas confirmed an investigation. Wal-Mart said it had notified federal investigators in January.

Last fall, Hewlett-Packard found itself in the center of a scandal about the increasingly aggressive tactics for investigating information leaks from the company to the media. Patricia Dunn, HP's board chairwoman, resigned following reports that the company hired investigators who illegally obtained telephone records of board members and reporters by misrepresenting themselves to telephone companies.

Five people associated with the investigation, including Dunn, later were indicted by the state and face trial.

Wal-Mart went to great lengths Monday to distance itself from its employee's actions.

The company said it does not believe any laws were broken by the recordings, since Wal-Mart notifies employees that it may monitor and record communications on company devices.

Under federal and Arkansas law, only one party to a recording -- in this case, Wal-Mart -- needs to consent. Wal-Mart declined to release the names of employees involved.

The company said it began in internal investigation Jan. 11, after an employee expressed concerns about the recordings.

The technician programmed in certain phone numbers and then recorded those conversations without the knowledge of the PR staff involved, the company said.

Text messages were electronically grabbed from pagers and other hand-held devices using the technician's personal equipment, Williams said. She declined to specify the key words or the equipment used.

The New York Times helped fuel a firestorm against Wal-Mart in the fall of 2005 when it published an internal memo detailing the company's recommendations for reining in health-care costs. The suggestions included making jobs more physically rigorous to discourage unhealthy workers and using more part-time workers.

DOJ_NMG_0141446

CRIMINAL LAW:

Analysis: Verdict Puts Focus On Cheney (AP)

By Tom Raum

AP, March 7, 2007

Campaigning in 2000, George Bush promised he would swear on the Bible to restore honor and dignity to a sullied White House and give it "one heck of a scrubbing." The conviction of I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby gave the White House a scrubbing — but not the one Bush had in mind.

The case laid bare the inner workings of a presidency under siege and the secretive world of Vice President Dick Cheney.

It showed the lengths to which Cheney went in early summer 2003 to discredit administration critic Joseph Wilson. The former ambassador's assertions had cast doubt on the administration's justification for having taken the country to war in Iraq. And the Libby case showed the president assisting Cheney in the leaked attacks on Wilson.

Libby, who was Cheney's chief of staff, was found guilty on Tuesday of four of five counts of obstructing justice, lying and perjury during an investigation into the administration's disclosure of the identity of undercover CIA official Valerie Plame, Wilson's wife.

The verdict "does great damage to the Bush administration," said Paul C. Light, professor of public service at New York University. "It undermines the president's pledge of ethical conduct. But the most serious consequence is that it will raise questions about Cheney's durability in office. It may be time for Cheney to submit his resignation."

But don't count on it. Bush in the past has repeatedly come to the defense of his vice president.

The trial, which included a month of testimony, is also relevant as the U.S. seeks to build a case that Iran is providing sophisticated munitions to Shiite insurgents in Iraq who are using them against U.S. troops. Administration critics have suggested the administration is trying to lay the groundwork for isolating or even attacking Iran — using flawed intelligence, like in Iraq.

Wilson, a retired career diplomat, had accused the administration of manipulating intelligence to build its case to invade Iraq.

The trial leaves a trail of unanswered questions leading to the doorsteps of Bush and Cheney.

Testimony and evidence did not clear up whether they directed the leaking of Plame's identity to the news media.

But the trial did show Bush declassified prewar intelligence that Libby leaked to New York Times reporter Judith Miller, a plan carried out in such secrecy that no one in the government except Bush, Cheney and Libby even knew about it.

Testimony showed the vice president was aware early on that Wilson's wife worked at the CIA and told Libby about it. Cheney even scribbled a note to himself a week before Wilson's wife was exposed asking whether she had sent her husband on the CIA mission to Africa that triggered the controversy.

Cheney also directed Libby to speak with selected reporters to counter Wilson's accusations. Cheney developed talking points on the matter for the White House press office. He helped draft a statement by then-CIA Director George Tenet. And he moved to declassify some intelligence material to bolster the case against Wilson.

Lanny Davis, a lawyer who worked in the Clinton White House during several investigations, said Tuesday that, while Libby was the defendant, "it was Vice President Cheney who was on trial today and who has the responsibility for what Libby did. The vice president has a personal and moral responsibility to take responsibility for what Mr. Libby did at his instruction — and to apologize to Valerie Plame."

Cheney said in a statement that he was "very disappointed with the verdict" and that Libby had "served our nation tirelessly and with great distinction." Cheney said he would withhold further comment because Libby was seeking a new trial or, if necessary, an appeal.

Prosecutors said Libby concocted a story to avoid losing his job for disclosing classified information to reporters without authorization. Libby's attorneys said any errors resulted from memory flaws.

The White House refused to comment on the possibility that Bush would pardon Libby. He was the only one charged in the case, and he was not charged with deliberately disclosing Plame's identity, which can be a federal crime, but with lying to investigators and a grand jury. Testimony showed there were other leakers, including adviser Karl Rove, former White House press secretary Ari Fleischer and former Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage.

The White House has never corrected the denials it issued in the fall of 2003 saying neither Rove nor Libby was involved in the leak of Plame's CIA identity. Political observers doubt any correction will be made.

DOJ_NMG_0141447

"What's really focused people's attention is the loss of American troops in Iraq and it's allowed Bush, Cheney and Rove — once he wasn't indicted — to kind of be pushed off the radar screen" regarding the Plame affair, said presidential historian Robert Dallek.

Democrats used the verdicts to attack Cheney. "Lewis Libby has been convicted of perjury, but his trial revealed deeper truths about Vice President Cheney's role in this sordid affair. Now President Bush must pledge not to pardon Libby for his criminal conduct," said Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev.

White House spokeswoman Dana Perino would not characterize the verdict as embarrassing for the White House. "I think that we have been able to continue on in moving forward on all sorts of different fronts," she said.

It's not the administration's first ethics-related conviction. Two former Bush administration officials have been convicted in investigations related to jailed Republican lobbyist Jack Abramoff.

Last June, a former White House aide, David H. Safavian, was convicted of lying to government investigators about his ties to Abramoff. He faces an 180-month prison sentence. Roger Stillwell, a former Interior Department official, pleaded guilty in August to a misdemeanor charge for not reporting tickets he received from Abramoff.

For An Opaque White House, A Reflection Of New Scrutiny (WP)

By Peter Baker

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

Shortly before he was inaugurated for his second term, President Bush was asked why no one was held responsible for the mistakes of the first. "We had an accountability moment," he replied, "and that's called the 2004 elections."

Two years and a stinging midterm election later, Bush is having another accountability moment, but this one isn't working out as well. The conviction of former White House aide I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby has coincided with a string of investigations into the mistreatment of injured soldiers and the purge of federal prosecutors, putting the operations of his administration into harsh relief.

The timing may be coincidental, but the confluence of events has revived a pattern largely missing through the six years of Bush's presidency, in which high-level officials accused of wrongdoing are grilled, fired and sometimes even jailed. For an administration that has been unusually opaque and mostly insulated from aggressive congressional oversight and prosecutorial investigation, it may seem like a gut-churning harbinger.

While the president's aides watch uncomfortably as one hearing after another plays out on Capitol Hill, the Libby conviction hit a nerve inside the White House. The onetime chief of staff to Vice President Cheney was well liked in the West Wing, and the notion of him going to prison dispirited the colleagues glued to televisions as the verdict was announced. Bush watched in the Oval Office with aides Joshua B. Bolten and Dan Bartlett, then instructed Bartlett to put out a statement expressing sadness for Libby.

"This has been a huge cloud over the White House," said Ed Rogers, a Republican lobbyist close to the Bush team. "It caused a lot of intellectual, emotional and political energy to be expended when it should have been expended on the agenda. They're never going to fully recover from this. If you're looking at legacy, this episode gets prominently mentioned in every recap of the Bush administration, much like Iran-contra and Monica Lewinsky."

The Libby case never reached the level of those scandals, of course, but it became a proxy for many in Washington eager to re-litigate the origins of the Iraq war. If Libby lied about his role in the CIA leak case, critics eagerly used that to reinforce their argument that Bush led the nation to war on false pretenses, in effect attacking the centerpiece of his presidency.

"This verdict brings accountability at last for official deception and the politics of smear and fear," said Sen. John F. Kerry (Mass.), Bush's Democratic challenger in 2004.

While the White House publicly withheld comment, some Bush advisers expressed outrage, seeing a double standard and citing the documents-smuggling case of former Clinton national security adviser Samuel R. Berger. "Scooter didn't do anything," said former Cheney counselor Mary Matalin. "And his personal record and service are impeccable. How do you make sense of a system where a security principal admits to stuffing classified docs in his pants and says, 'I'm sorry,' and a guy who is rebutting a demonstrable partisan liar is going through this madness?"

A senior official, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because the president ordered aides not to comment publicly, disputed the idea that Bush has escaped scrutiny in the past. "I don't buy the conventional wisdom that we haven't had accountability in the past," he said. "Is it different because Democrats are in charge? Of course. . . . But that's fine, that's a reality that we're prepared to deal with."

No one has been quicker to declare the return of accountability than Democrats, who are using their newfound subpoena power to sharp effect in hauling up Pentagon officials to answer for poor conditions at Walter Reed Army Medical Center and in giving fired U.S. attorneys a venue to blame their dismissals on administration politics. In two months, Democrats have held 81

DOJ_NMG_0141448

hearings on Iraq. "This is just the beginning," said Rep. Rahm Emanuel (Ill.), chairman of the House Democratic Caucus. "What a difference a year makes."

But accountability politics can also be dangerous to the touch. Washington became consumed during the presidency of Emanuel's onetime boss, Bill Clinton, whose administration came under scrutiny of at least seven independent counsels and even more Republican congressional committees. The atmosphere was so toxic that Clinton adviser Paul Begala put an attorney on retainer before even joining the White House staff.

The Republican-led impeachment of Clinton for lying under oath about his affair with Lewinsky backfired politically, and Washington grew so leery that it let the independent-counsel law lapse. When Bush was elected along with a Congress controlled by the same party, a new era was ushered in. With occasional exceptions, such as the commission that looked into the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks, Bush largely escaped the klieg-light atmosphere. No senior officials were fired for the missing weapons in Iraq or the Abu Ghraib abuse. Three officials blamed by some for mishandling Iraq were given Medals of Freedom.

That began changing after Hurricane Katrina ravaged New Orleans in 2005 and congressional Republicans investigated the administration's slow response. The change accelerated with the Democratic victory in the November elections. The next day, Bush fired Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld after months of deteriorating conditions in Iraq. Rumsfeld's successor, Robert M. Gates, has proved willing to fire others for mismanaging Walter Reed.

The risk for Democrats would be overplaying the accountability hand. Their attempts to impose limits on Bush's ability to fight the war have collapsed repeatedly and left them unable to fashion a coherent approach to the most serious issue in the country. Some Republicans suggested that the public could tire of repeated hearings such as those held this week and write them off to partisanship.

"They bring up sort of old Washington," said former Bush aide Nicolle Wallace. "The Democrats have to walk a fine line and be careful. People don't want to turn on the TV and see every story being about the obstruction of people trying to do things. . . . The people who will stand out in Washington are the ones who will look forward."

Two people looking forward with choices to make are Bush and Libby. The president came under instant pressure from conservatives to pardon his former aide. "Justice demands that Bush issue a pardon and lower the curtain on an embarrassing drama that shouldn't have lasted beyond its opening act," National Review said within hours of the verdict.

And Libby may have to decide if he has anything else to tell authorities. John Q. Barrett, an Iran-contra prosecutor who teaches at St. John's University, recalled James W. McCord Jr. in Watergate and Alan Fiers in Iran-contra, who under threat of prison recanted past versions of events. If the jury was right that Libby lied, Barrett said, "he's now sitting wherever he is with cold sweat and troubled stomach and truth that he hasn't told. . . . Whatever the chips, if he held them and didn't lay them down, this may be the moment to decide."

White House Already On The Defensive Takes Another Hit With Guilty Verdict (NYT)

By Jim Rutenberg

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON, March 6 — At midday on Tuesday, President Bush ushered two top aides into the Oval Office to watch an unhappy moment for his administration play out on live television: the first felony conviction of a member of his inner circle.

Deep into his second term, Mr. Bush faces an array of political and policy problems that seem to be growing by the day. His once-powerful standing with the public has been leached away by the war in Iraq. His party, dogged by corruption charges, has lost power on Capitol Hill, leaving him exposed to a Democratic opposition that is now armed with subpoena power and the energy that comes from a good shot at recapturing the White House in 2008. His domestic agenda is stalled, and his foreign policy is constrained.

The conviction on Tuesday of I. Lewis Libby Jr., the former chief of staff to Vice President Dick Cheney and assistant to the president, came in a week when Mr. Bush was already dealing with Congressional hearings into the administration's handling of health care for members of the military injured in the war and its removal of federal prosecutors from their jobs under circumstances that Democrats suggest could be politically motivated.

Once again, Mr. Bush was put on the defensive about the underlying issue in the case, the administration's use of intelligence to justify the invasion of Iraq. And suddenly the White House was parrying questions about the possibility of a pardon for Mr. Libby.

Current and former officials said in interviews that the trial was primarily a Washington fascination that had left the public confused as the investigation veered from accusations that officials had leaked the name of a confidential C.I.A. operative to rebut a war critic — her husband — to charges that Mr. Libby had lied to officials investigating them.

But several acknowledged that the word "guilty" could greatly change the dynamic.

DOJ_NMG_0141449

"It does change things in the public's perception to some extent when a former high-level administration official is found guilty of a crime," said Scott McClellan, the former Bush press secretary. "It raises more questions in people's minds and increases their suspicions."

Mr. McClellan said he would advise the White House to address the verdict directly, but Dana Perino, the deputy press secretary, said it would not, adding that the president was "saddened" for Mr. Libby and his family and that Mr. Bush had watched the verdict's announcement with his chief of staff, Joshua B. Bolten, and Dan Bartlett, the White House counselor. And another official said it seemed the president had been relatively isolated from the case, with testimony largely focusing on Mr. Cheney's office.

Yet while the case never quite got into the Oval Office, it seemed to go right to the door.

In his grand jury testimony, Mr. Libby said the president had secretly declassified crucial intelligence on Iraq for Mr. Libby's use, at the request of the vice president and without the knowledge of other ranking officials. White House officials have said Mr. Bush never knew exactly how Mr. Libby planned to use the information.

The testimony also detailed how Karl Rove, the president's top political strategist, also discussed the C.I.A. operative, Valerie Wilson, with reporters, though the initial leak was tracked to Richard L. Armitage, the former deputy secretary of state.

Much of the White House staff at the time was questioned by investigators in the case or testified to the grand jury or both. Mr. Bush was himself interviewed.

And several of Mr. Bush's associates, including former Commerce Secretary Donald L. Evans and former Energy Secretary Spencer Abraham, served on the advisory committee of Mr. Libby's legal defense fund. That group said Tuesday that it was planning another fund-raising event for Mr. Libby.

The trial has also pointed up divisions within Mr. Bush's administration, with Mr. Libby testifying how he on more than one occasion had not clued in other officials to what he was doing. Among the latter was Stephen J. Hadley, then the top deputy to Condoleezza Rice when she was national security adviser, the title he now holds.

Sympathy for Mr. Libby among those with deep ties to the White House is widespread. "This is sickening" said Mary Matalin, Mr. Cheney's longtime counselor. "The system is broken."

John R. Bolton, until two months ago the United States ambassador to the United Nations and a close associate of Mr. Cheney and Mr. Libby, said in an interview, "This is just not the way justice should be followed."

The verdict contributed to the sense of a White House under siege, with good news scarce and Mr. Bush struggling to wield the presidential megaphone with the same success he did in his first term. Mr. Bush has just over 22 months left in office to regain his political footing.

Kenneth M. Duberstein, a former chief of staff to President Ronald Reagan in his second term, said: "This is a day consumed by nine G.I.'s killed in Iraq, 100 Iraqis dying, the continuing Walter Reed investigation into the mistreatment of our returning heroes, and the Libby verdict — four out of five counts guilty. No matter how you spin it, this was a bad, bad, bad news day for this White House."

Bush Administration Loses Some Spin Control In Washington (MCT)

By Ron Hutcheson

McClatchy Newspapers, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON - If President Bush ever thought things couldn't get any worse, he might want to reconsider.

After six years of setting the national agenda, with help from a compliant Congress, Bush is losing control of events in Washington. The new reality hit home Tuesday on multiple fronts.

At the federal courthouse, a jury convicted former White House aide I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby for perjury and obstruction of justice. On Capitol Hill, congressional committees demanded answers in separate investigations into the shoddy treatment of wounded soldiers and allegations of politically motivated firings at the Justice Department.

With Bush's job-approval ratings already so low they threaten his political viability, the latest eruptions of bad news could weaken him further with 22 months left to go in his term.

"When each story comes out, it adds to perceptions of an administration that is potentially incompetent and potentially corrupt," said Julian Zelizer, a political historian at Boston University. "Second-term presidents always have trouble. On a scale of bad to worse for second-term presidents, he's at worse."

In a speech to the American Legion, always a friendly audience for Bush, the president was on the defensive Tuesday over the shoddy treatment of war veterans at Walter Reed Army Medical Center.

"It's unacceptable to me, it is unacceptable to you, it's unacceptable to our country - and it's not going to continue," he said.

DOJ_NMG_0141450

Bush announced the appointment of former Sen. Bob Dole, a Republican, and former Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala, a Democrat, to head a bipartisan commission that will recommend improvements in health-care services for veterans and active-duty personnel.

Even as Bush spoke, members of the Senate Armed Services Committee were holding other administration officials to account for putting wounded soldiers in moldy, rat-infested facilities.

In contrast to the loose oversight Republicans exercised when they controlled Congress, Democrats started issuing subpoenas for congressional investigations soon after The Washington Post highlighted the lousy conditions.

"Is Walter Reed just the tip of the iceberg?" Sen. John McCain, R-Ariz., asked top Pentagon officials at the hearing. "These kinds of problems are viewed as unacceptable by everyone. Apparently, they exist in other bases around the nation as well."

Congressional committees also moved aggressively after McClatchy Newspapers raised questions about dismissals of eight federal prosecutors across the country. In testimony before two separate committees Tuesday, some of the prosecutors complained of political interference. Several alleged that they were forced to resign as part of a political purge with possible White House links.

Bush hasn't addressed those allegations, but his Justice Department officials insisted that the prosecutors were dismissed because of poor performance, even though they'd received positive job reviews shortly before their dismissals.

Bush also had nothing to say about the Libby verdict after he watched its announcement on television, but spokeswoman Dana Perino said the president "respected" the jury's decision and was "saddened" for Libby and his family.

Democrats demanded that Bush rule out the possibility of a pardon.

"I don't think that speculating on a wildly hypothetical situation at this time is appropriate," Perino said, without ruling out a presidential pardon. One influential conservative publication, National Review, wrote an on-line editorial urging Bush to pardon Libby.

Libby's trial exposed White House infighting and showed how determined Bush and his advisers were to shut down dissenting voices in the run-up to the Iraq invasion. Even though the jury convicted Libby, a spokesman for the panel gave credence to Libby's claim that he was a scapegoat for higher-ranking White House officials.

Libby was convicted of lying to investigators who were trying to determine the source of a news leak that exposed the identity of CIA employee Valerie Plame, the wife of White House critic Joe Wilson. Testimony showed that Libby was directed to talk with reporters by Vice President Dick Cheney.

Denis Collins, a former reporter who was selected by jurors to represent them before news cameras, said the panel concluded that Libby was "the fall guy" for the White House. He said jurors wondered why they never heard from presidential adviser Karl Rove, who has admitted talking to reporters about Plame, or other White House officials involved in the case.

"It was said a number of times, `What are we doing with this guy here? Where's Rove? Where are these other guys?'" Collins told reporters after the verdict.

Stephen Hess, a presidential scholar at the Brookings Institution, said the trial "showed a lot of things about the administration that were dysfunctional" and added to the president's pile of woes.

"You have a fair number of unconnected things. What unites them is that none of them is good news for the president of the United States," said Hess, who worked in the White House during the Eisenhower and Nixon administrations. "It's part of the natural history of a presidency - the longer they go on, the more problems they accumulate."

Verdict Seen As Stain On White House Too (LAT)

By Maura Reynolds And James Gerstenzang

The Los Angeles Times, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON — — The verdict in the I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby trial was more than a judgment against one of the Bush administration's most senior aides: It was also seen as an indictment of the White House political operation he helped design and direct.

And it undermined the administration's credibility at a time when the president is trying to build support for his Iraq war policy in the face of increasingly outspoken opposition from Democrats and deepening skepticism among voters.

Libby's conviction on charges of lying to federal investigators raises another difficult issue, one the White House may find it hard to shake off as the 2008 political campaign gathers speed: the possibility of a pardon.

Libby's conviction on four counts of lying to federal investigators about the Valerie Plame leak case hits the administration on several levels: In addition to eroding its already weak credibility on Iraq, it sullies the integrity of an administration that came into office with pledges of moral rectitude.

DOJ_NMG_0141451

Getting past those problems will be harder because the question of whether Bush should or would use his pardon power on Libby's behalf probably will dog the White House through the 2008 presidential campaign and into the last days of his administration. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) threw down the gauntlet just minutes after the verdict was read.

"Lewis Libby has been convicted of perjury, but his trial revealed deeper truths about Vice President Cheney's role in this sordid affair. Now President Bush must pledge not to pardon Libby for his criminal conduct," Reid said in a statement.

Libby's appeals will also keep the case in the spotlight.

Though many outside Washington saw the long trial as a kind of political circus, the charges were some of the most serious to be prosecuted in Washington in many years. As a result, the conviction may turn out to be a more serious blow to the administration than many may have foreseen.

"This administration was very scandal-free in its early years," said David Gergen, a Republican political strategist and expert in damage control. "Now for the first time they have a criminal taint at the highest reaches of the president's circle. That's something they are not going to be able to erase."

The verdict came amid a seeming torrent of bad news for the White House.

"Another red-letter day for the administration," said Kenneth M. Duberstein, who was President Reagan's final White House chief of staff, noting other news on Tuesday — the deaths from a bomb attack in Iraq, congressional hearings on neglect of veterans at Walter Reed Army Medical Center and a "happy-talk speech" on Iraq by Bush to the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

"This cascade of bad news doesn't stop, and it's catching up to them," Duberstein said, referring to Bush and Cheney.

The rough road ahead for the White House was signaled by the aggressive reactions of Democrats to news of the verdict — and by the effort of many prominent Republicans to sidestep the development, rather than rush to the administration's defense.

Democrats have long complained that Bush's political aides have manipulated information and policy decisions — both at home and overseas — to a degree unprecedented in the recent past. They have blamed Cheney and his aides, as well as political strategist Karl Rove, for their highly political approach to the decision to depose Saddam Hussein and occupy Iraq, as well as such issues as the abortive campaign to overhaul Social Security.

"The jury's verdict confirms the lengths to which the White House — particularly the office of the vice president — was willing to go to conceal their effort to vilify anyone who spoke the truth about the flaws in their justification for war," said Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.).

"Today's guilty verdicts are not solely about the acts of one individual," said House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-San Francisco). "This trial provided a troubling picture of the inner workings of the Bush administration. The testimony unmistakably revealed — at the highest levels of the Bush administration — a callous disregard in handling sensitive national security information and a disposition to smear critics of the war in Iraq."

For the most part, Republicans tried to dodge questions about the verdict.

"I'm not going to comment," said Sen. Jon Kyl (R-Ariz.), when confronted with a question during a news conference, "except I will say I know Scooter Libby and I've always considered him to be a fine man and a dedicated public servant."

Tom Griscom, who as White House communications director during the final two years of the Reagan administration was at the center of efforts to rebuild the president's image and political standing after the Iran-Contra scandal, said that Bush, Cheney and their neoconservative advisors may not pay a huge price for Libby's conviction.

That's because their credibility was already damaged, he said.

The administration's integrity had been successfully challenged some time ago, he said, as the reasons it cited for going to war in Iraq began to crumble. "It's almost like this is just one more piece on ... that pile of lost credibility," he said.

Griscom said that because Libby worked directly for Cheney, his conviction "taints the administration, but it doesn't go directly into the Oval Office."

"This is clearly aimed at the vice president's office, not the Oval Office," he said.

Kenneth Khachigian, a California Republican political consultant who has known Cheney since they both worked in the Nixon administration, said the verdict would have little political impact because "whatever negative elements there were played out at the time of the investigation and indictment. It's not going to get any worse."

One of the few Republicans who sounded a defiant note was Mary Matalin, a former aide to the vice president who serves as an outside advisor. She said she did not think there would be any "political fallout" for Cheney.

"Everyone is really sad," Matalin said, adding that there was "lots of respect and affection for Scooter" among Cheney associates.

Presidents often suffer politically for issuing pardons, which helps explain why they usually wait until their final days in office to do so. And in the most high-profile cases, it can be up to the president's successor to issue the pardon.

DOJ_NMG_0141452

For instance, it was Bush's father who pardoned six former Reagan administration officials, including former Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger in 1992.

Gergen said that Bush was unlikely to consider a pardon until after the 2008 presidential campaign. Even then it would be politically difficult, unless Libby's expected appeal was past and he was already serving his sentence.

Libby Falls But Cheney, Rove Emerge Untouched (CHIT)

By Mark Silva

Chicago Tribune, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON -- The former chief of staff for Vice President Dick Cheney now stands convicted of obstruction of justice and perjury in an investigation of the naming of a CIA agent whose husband had accused the Bush administration of manipulating intelligence used to make the case for the invasion of Iraq.

Yet Cheney, perhaps the administration's most ardent supporter of the war, remains largely untouched by the investigation and trial of Lewis "Scooter" Libby that painted the powerful vice president as one keenly interested in discrediting the critic of the administration's pre-war intelligence.

And Cheney isn't the only pivotal member of the administration who has survived the probe of the leak of CIA agent Valerie Plame's identity in the summer of 2003 after her husband, ex-Ambassador Joseph Wilson, publicly challenged the administration's claims that Iraq had sought to obtain nuclear fuel in Africa. Karl Rove, President Bush's confidant, deputy chief of staff and architect of two presidential campaigns, had served as a source for reporters covering the Wilson affair.

More than three years after a White House spokesman maintained that "if anyone in this administration was involved in it, they would no longer be in this administration," Cheney and Rove steadfastly refuse to comment on the investigation.

But both hold as much sway as ever in an administration facing increasing challenges over the war in Iraq.

Cheney recently completed a globe-encircling journey to press the administration's case for the U.S.-led wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, while Rove and his wife hosted the president and First Lady Laura Bush for dinner Sunday night.

"In terms of accountability, I think it speaks volumes," Carl Tobias, professor of law at the University of Richmond, said of Libby's conviction and the fact that Cheney and Rover remain pivotal figures in President Bush's White House.

The conclusion of the trial—after a two-year investigation of the CIA leak that led to Libby's indictment in October 2005 on charges of lying to a federal grand jury and U.S. Attorney Patrick Fitzgerald's prosecutors—comes at a crucial time for the Bush administration. With Congress challenging Bush's escalation of military force in Iraq, Tobias suggested, the Libby case underscores the lack of credibility in the original case for war.

"It comes at a critical time in terms of the administration trying to escalate the number of troops," Tobias said. "It just plays back on all the credibility questions of why the U.S. is there in the first place."

The White House maintains that the conviction of a former senior official should not undermine its credibility on the war.

"Let me just remind everybody of how the president took responsibility and has completely revamped the intelligence community," spokeswoman Dana Perino said.

Bush, who voiced "sadness" over the conviction of a loyal aide, watched the announcement of the verdict on an Oval Office television set with his own chief of staff. But the president also is avoiding comment on the case while Libby appeals his conviction, with Perino calling congressional speculation of a presidential pardon for Libby "wildly hypothetical."

Cheney echoed the note of disappointment for Libby, but declined to "comment on the merits of this matter until these proceedings are concluded."

Bush, in October 2003, said, "This is a very serious matter, and our administration takes it seriously. I have, at times, complained about leaks of security information… And I take those leaks very seriously."

The White House initially asserted that Rove had played no role in the leak. But columnist Robert Novak—who first identified Plame in July 2003 in one of his columns after Wilson published his critique on the Op-Ed page of The New York Times—testified that Rove confirmed Plame's identity for him after then-Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage named her. Armitage has since left the administration.

According to Libby's notes of a staff meeting at the time, Rove was among those actively seeking to discredit Wilson's opinion. "We're a day late in getting responses to the story," Rove said at a staff meeting.

But it was the vice president, according to his then-chief of staff's grand jury testimony, who told aides: "Get the full story out."

Libby, who identified Plame in meetings with a Times reporter, was not indicted for leaking her name, but rather for lying to prosecutors about when and from whom he had learned it. He had not learned of her name from NBC News' Tim Russert, as he first told investigators, but rather from Cheney.

DOJ_NMG_0141453

In the post-trial aftermath, Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) claimed: "The jury's verdict confirms the lengths to which the White House—particularly the office of the vice president—was willing to go to conceal their effort to vilify anyone who spoke the truth about the flaws in their justification for war. This administration misled the American people in the rush to go to war, then exposed a CIA operative in an effort to hide their own mistakes."

Cheney had expected to be called as a witness in Libby's defense, to support his contention that he was so consumed with work that he had forgotten how he first learned of Plame's identity. But, neither Libby nor Cheney took the witness stand.

"They must have thought that the prosecution's case was not strong enough for them to have to call Libby or Cheney," Tobias said of Libby's defense lawyers. "And there also was the serious threat that Fitzgerald would rip them apart when he had them on the stand, and that would open up everything."

Free-Fall For The Fall Guy (WP)

By Dana Milbank

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

Minutes after Scooter Libby's guilty verdict was read, Pat Fitzgerald did his best Eliot Ness impression as his prosecution team marched, Untouchables-style, across the federal courthouse plaza under a perfect blue sky. But it didn't take long for the clouds to roll in.

A reporter asked Fitzgerald if he still believed, as he had said in court, that there is a "cloud over the White House." The sunny victor turned slightly overcast at this memory and declined to say whether the gloom had lifted. "By Mr. Libby obstructing justice and lying about what happened, he had failed to remove the cloud," Fitzgerald said. "And sometimes when people tell the truth, clouds disappear."

The cloud over the White House grew darker a few minutes later, when juror Denis Collins, standing in front of the same microphone, spoke of the "tremendous amount of sympathy" jurors had for the man they convicted. "It was said a number of times, 'What are we doing with this guy here? Where's Rove, where's -- you know, where are these other guys?' " Collins said. "We're not saying that we didn't think Mr. Libby was guilty of the things we found him guilty of, but that it seemed like he was . . . the fall guy."

As a political matter, Libby's trial had long ago ceased to be about one man's guilt or innocence. Witnesses made it plain that at least three other administration officials had joined Libby in leaking the identity of undercover CIA officer Valerie Plame, including top Bush strategist Karl Rove and former White House press secretary Ari Fleischer (whom jurors dubbed "Slick Willie"). Libby's conviction, and Collins's "fall guy" remark, only increased the determination of congressional Democrats to spread the blame throughout the White House.

Harry Reid, the Senate Democratic leader, issued a press release titled, "The Fall Guy."

"Scooter Libby ended up being the fall guy," Sen. Chuck Schumer (D-N.Y.) said in his statement.

Plame's husband, former ambassador Joe Wilson, gave a quick news conference to assert that "the president and the vice president owe the country a much broader explanation of their own actions at this time."

Vice President Cheney, the ex-boss for whom Libby allegedly took the fall, respectfully disagreed. "I plan to have no further comment on the merits of this matter until these proceedings are concluded," he said in a statement. With Libby planning an appeal, that could keep Cheney silent for the rest of his term.

The fall guy himself was equally quiet. Just after noon in the sixth-floor courtroom, when the jury forewoman read the first guilty verdict, Libby briefly closed his eyes. While she read the other counts -- he was guilty on four of five -- Libby looked at his lawyer Ted Wells, who rubbed his chin. Libby's other lawyer, Bill Jeffress, exhaled deeply.

Libby's wife, Harriet Grant, was not as composed. In the first row of spectators, she hunched over and shook. A young member of Libby's defense team put his arm around her shoulders. After judge and jury left, Grant went over to hug her husband with a furious look on her face. Three reporters heard her say what sounded like, "We're gonna [expletive] 'em."

Libby maintained his stoic look as he walked out to the cameras with Grant and his lawyers. Wells uttered a mere 119 words and took no questions, prompting about 25 photographers, 15 camera crews and dozens of reporters to chase Libby back into the courthouse.

"Are you willing to go to prison to protect Vice President Cheney?" shouted NBC's David Shuster.

"Do you expect a pardon?" another reporter called out.

"Come on, now!" Wells shouted at the photographers. "Come on. Watch that camera!" One cameraman fell on the courthouse steps directly in front of Libby. The fallen cameraman got a hand up -- from the fall guy himself.

The crews' exuberance was understandable; after a month-long trial and two weeks of jury deliberations, the journalists became giddy when e-mails summoned them to the courthouse for a verdict. Slate.com's John Dickerson abandoned his car on

DOJ_NMG_0141454

19th Street. Others fled a Senate hearing on Capitol Hill. At the courthouse, Neil Lewis of the New York Times accepted congratulations for winning $40 in a betting pool on when the verdict would be reached.

Collins, the only juror willing to face the cameras after the verdict was read, was similarly energetic as he recounted the deliberations. "I was thinking, 'Wow, maybe we'll get to see President Bush here," he recalled, his hand in a pocket of his green ski jacket. He went on to regale the reporters with jurors' "lust" for the "hot-dog, half-smoke guy across the street in front of the DMV." Collins continued, unbidden: "My father, when he came from Ireland, he worked right across the street. . . . He made sandwiches across from the courthouse."

But Fitzgerald, even in victory, declined to join in the carnival. "The results are actually sad," he posited. "It's sad that we had a situation where a high-level official . . . obstructed justice and lied under oath."

Did he feel vindicated? "It's not the verdict that justifies the investigation, it's the facts," he demurred.

Any further charges? "I would not expect to see any," he said. "We're all going back to our day jobs."

All, except for the fall guy.

A Judgment On Cheney Is Still To Come (NYT)

By Sheryl Gay Stolberg

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON, March 6 — In legal terms, the jury has spoken in the Libby case. In political terms, Dick Cheney is still awaiting a judgment.

For weeks, Washington watched, mesmerized, as the trial of I. Lewis Libby Jr. cast Vice President Cheney, his former boss, in the role of puppeteer, pulling the strings in a covert public relations campaign to defend the Bush administration's case for war in Iraq and discredit a critic.

"There is a cloud over the vice president," the prosecutor, Patrick J. Fitzgerald, told the jury in summing up the case last month.

Mr. Cheney was not charged in the case, cooperated with the investigation and expressed a willingness to testify if called, though he never was. Yet he was a central figure throughout, fighting back against suggestions that he and President Bush had taken the country to war on the basis of flawed intelligence, showing himself to be keenly sensitive to how he was portrayed in the news media and backing Mr. Libby to the end.

With Tuesday's verdict on Mr. Libby — guilty on four of five counts, including perjury and obstruction of justice — Mr. Cheney's critics, and even some of his supporters, said the vice president had been diminished.

"The trial has been death by 1,000 cuts for Cheney," said Scott Reed, a Republican strategist. "It's hurt him inside the administration. It's hurt him with the Congress, and it's hurt his stature around the world because it has shown a lot of the inner workings of the White House. It peeled the bark right off the way they operate."

The legal question in the case was whether Mr. Libby lied to investigators and prosecutors looking into the leak of the name of a C.I.A. operative, Valerie Wilson, whose husband, the former ambassador Joseph C. Wilson IV, wrote an Op-Ed article in The New York Times accusing the White House of distorting pre-war intelligence. Mr. Cheney scrawled notes on a copy of the article, asking "did his wife send him on a junket?"

Now, Mr. Cheney faces a civil suit from Mr. Wilson.

The political question was whether Mr. Libby, the vice president's former chief of staff, was "the fall guy" for his boss, in the words of Senator Charles E. Schumer, Democrat of New York. Though the defense introduced a note from Mr. Cheney worrying that Mr. Libby was being sacrificed to protect other White House officials, some say the vice president bears responsibility for the fate of his former aide, known as Scooter.

"It was clear that what Scooter was doing in the Wilson case was at Dick's behest," said Kenneth L. Adelman, a former Reagan administration official who has been close with both men but has broken with Mr. Cheney over the Iraq war. "That was clear. It was clear from Dick's notes on the Op-Ed piece that he wanted to go get Wilson. And Scooter's not that type. He's not a vindictive person."

Mr. Cheney is arguably the most powerful vice president in American history, and perhaps the most secretive. The trial painted a portrait of a man immersed in the kind of political pushback that is common to all White Houses, yet often presumed to be the province of low-level political operatives, not the vice president of the United States.

Prosecutors played a tape of Mr. Libby testifying to a grand jury that Mr. Cheney had asked Mr. Bush to declassify an intelligence report selectively so he, Mr. Libby, could leak it to sympathetic reporters. Mr. Cheney's hand-written scribbles were introduced into evidence at the trial, including the one that hinted Mr. Cheney believed that his own staffer, Mr. Libby, was being sacrificed.

DOJ_NMG_0141455

"'Not going to protect one staffer + sacrifice the guy who was asked to stick his neck in the meat-grinder because of the incompetence of others," the note read.

Mr. Cheney's defenders insisted the vice president was not out to smear Mr. Wilson or even clear his own name, but simply to defend a policy he fiercely believed in.

"There wasn't some Cheney strategy or Wilson strategy," said Mary Matalin, Mr. Cheney's former political director. "There was only one strategy: to convey the nature of the intelligence and the nature of the threat."

Ms. Matalin said Mr. Cheney remained as influential as ever where it counts — with Mr. Bush.

Still, liberal critics of the administration had a field day with the trial. They are hoping the Democrats who now control Congress will use the case to investigate Mr. Cheney's role further. Mr. Schumer, who was among the first to call for a special prosecutor in the case, suggested in an interview that they might.

"I think there is a view in the public that Libby was the fall guy," Mr. Schumer said, "and I do think we will look at how the case shows the misuse of intelligence both before and after the war in Iraq."

Such issues are already of intense interest to scholars, who say the Libby case will invariably shape Mr. Cheney's legacy.

Historians typically pay scant attention to vice presidents, unless they become president. Mr. Cheney, though, is an exception. The historian Robert Dallek, who has written about presidents including Lyndon B. Johnson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Ronald Reagan and John F. Kennedy, predicts scholars will "be racing for vice-presidential records in a way that we've never seen before" to answer questions raised by the Libby trial.

"It will deepen the impressions of someone who was a tremendous manipulator and was very defensive about mistakes," Mr. Dallek said, "and I think it will greatly deepen the impression of a political operator who knew the ins and outs of Washington hardball politics. He's going to be, I think, the most interesting vice president in history to study."

On a personal level, friends of the vice president say the trial has been deeply painful for him. Mr. Libby and Mr. Cheney were all but inseparable — Ms. Matalin has called the former aide "Cheney's Cheney" — and often started their days by riding to work together. Mr. Libby accompanied the vice president almost everywhere he went, and Mr. Cheney made clear his high professional and personal regard for his aide, even playing host to a book party for him in 2002 at his official residence. Alan K. Simpson, a Republican former senator from Mr. Cheney's home state, Wyoming, said he saw Mr. Cheney over Christmas and asked how he was doing. He took the answer as a kind of oblique reference to the Libby case.

"He said, 'I'm fine, I'm O.K., I have people I trust around me — it's the same old stuff, Al,' " Mr. Simpson recalled.

Another friend of Mr. Cheney's, Vin Weber, a Republican former congressman, said the verdict had "got to be heartbreaking for the vice president." But Mr. Weber said he wished Mr. Cheney would explain himself.

"I don't think he has to do a long apologia," Mr. Weber said, "but I think he should say something, just to pierce the boil a little bit."

Instead, Mr. Cheney maintained his silence Tuesday. As the verdicts were being read, he went to the Capitol for the Republicans' regular weekly policy luncheon. Later, he issued a two-paragraph statement saying only that he was disappointed with the verdict, "saddened for Scooter and his family" and would have no further comment while an appeal is pending.

With a career in politics that goes back to the Nixon White House, Mr. Cheney is no stranger to Washington scandal and how to weather it. Senator Lindsey Graham, Republican of South Carolina, said he went hunting with the vice president late last year and did not sense that the trial was bothering him.

Libby Guilty Of Lying In C.I.A. Leak Case (NYT)

By Neil A. Lewis

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON, March 6 — I. Lewis Libby Jr., the former chief of staff to Vice President Dick Cheney, was convicted on Tuesday of lying to a grand jury and to F.B.I. agents investigating the leak of the identity of a C.I.A. operative in the summer of 2003 amid a fierce public dispute over the war in Iraq.

Mr. Libby, 56, who once wielded great authority at the top levels of government, is the highest-ranking White House official to be convicted of a felony since the Iran-contra scandals of the 1980s.

The jury rejected Mr. Libby's claims of memory lapses, convicting him of four felony counts, obstruction of justice, giving false statements to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and committing perjury twice before the grand jury. The 11-member jury acquitted Mr. Libby on an additional count of making false statements to the F.B.I.

As the verdict was read aloud by the jury forewoman after nearly 10 days of deliberations, Mr. Libby grimaced briefly before resuming his expressionless demeanor. His wife, Harriet Grant, sitting a few feet away in the spectator section, began shaking visibly and wept briefly before composing herself.

Dana Perino, the deputy White House press secretary, said President Bush watched the news of the verdict on television in the Oval Office. She said Mr. Bush respected the jury's verdict but "was saddened for Scooter Libby and his family," using Mr. Libby's nickname.

Mr. Cheney had a similar reaction. "As I have said before, Scooter has served our nation tirelessly and with great distinction through many years of public service," he said.

The verdict meant the end of a nearly four-year investigation into the leak of the identity of the Central Intelligence Agency officer, Valerie Wilson. The inquiry raised fundamental questions about the reasons for invading Iraq, exposed some of the unseen influence of Mr. Cheney's office and changed the landscape of relations between journalists and official sources, as many of Washington's prominent political reporters were forced to testify in a criminal trial.

Mr. Libby's chief lawyer, Theodore V. Wells Jr., said he would file papers asking the judge to grant a new trial. If that fails, Mr. Wells told reporters, he will appeal the verdict to the federal appeals court. He said Mr. Libby was "totally innocent and that he did not do anything wrong."

Mr. Libby, standing at his side, made no comment. Prosecutors had charged that Mr. Libby had lied when he swore that he had not discussed the identity of Ms. Wilson in the summer of 2003 with two reporters, Judith Miller, formerly of The New York Times, and Matthew Cooper, formerly of Time magazine.

The prosecution also said Mr. Libby concocted a story that he learned of Ms. Wilson's identity in a conversation with Tim Russert of NBC News on July 10 or 11 in 2003 to hide the fact that he had already learned about her identity from several fellow administration officials.

One of the 11 jurors who spoke publicly after the verdict said that there was great sympathy for Mr. Libby in the jury room, but that the case presented by the prosecution was overwhelming.

Judge Reggie B. Walton, who presided over the four weeks of testimony and presentation of evidence, set sentencing for June 5. Under complicated sentencing guidelines that are no longer mandatory, Judge Walton has wide discretion in setting a prison term.

But lawyers not involved in the case who are experienced in the issue of sentencing calculated that under the guidelines, Mr. Libby might be sentenced to 20 to 27 months.

Judge Walton allowed Mr. Libby to remain free on bail. The defense's plans to ask for a retrial and then appeal the verdict mean that it would be many months before Mr. Libby would be required to go to prison. It also would provide a window for Mr. Bush to pardon Mr. Libby, an issue about which the White House has been silent but one that quickly became a topic of speculation.

Senator Harry Reid of Nevada, the Democratic leader, issued a statement calling on Mr. Bush to promise that he would not "pardon Libby for his criminal conduct."

Patrick J. Fitzgerald, the prosecutor, said that while gratified by the verdict, "it's sad that we had a situation where a high-level official, a person who worked in the Office of Vice President, obstructed justice and lied under oath."

In remarks to reporters outside the courthouse, Mr. Fitzgerald also addressed at length the criticism of his decision to prosecute Mr. Libby on charges of lying to investigators while not charging anybody with leaking Ms. Wilson's name to reporters.

Ms. Wilson's name first appeared in a column by Robert Novak on July 14, 2003, just days after The New York Times published an Op-Ed article by her husband, Joseph C. Wilson IV.

In his article, Mr. Wilson asserted that the Bush White House had willfully distorted intelligence about Iraq's efforts to acquire uranium in Africa to bolster the case for going to war.

Testimony at the trial showed that Mr. Wilson's criticisms had alarmed and angered Bush administration officials because they amounted to a direct attack on what had been the principal reason for invading Iraq: the claim that Saddam Hussein had an active program of developing unconventional weapons.

Critics said Ms. Wilson's identity as a C.I.A. officer was leaked to punish her husband for his criticisms.

At the time Mr. Fitzgerald was named special prosecutor in the leak inquiry, investigators had already learned that Mr. Novak's sources were Richard L. Armitage, the deputy secretary of state, and Karl Rove, the president's chief political adviser.

In remarks to reporters on Tuesday, Mr. Fitzgerald said he nonetheless had no choice but to seek an indictment when he took over the investigation in December 2003, because he also had information that Mr. Libby had told a false story to the F.B.I. and to the grand jury about his conversation with Mr. Russert.

"It's inconceivable that any responsible prosecutor would walk away from the facts that we saw in December 2003 and say, 'There's nothing here, move on,' " Mr. Fitzgerald said.

"We cannot tolerate perjury," he said. "The truth is what drives our judicial system. If people don't come forward and tell the truth, we have no hope of making the judicial system work."

DOJ_NMG_0141457

Mr. Fitzgerald also faced criticism for forcing several reporters to testify about their confidential conversations with officials by threatening to have them jailed for contempt.

In the case of Ms. Miller, then of The Times, he had her jailed for 85 days until she agreed to testify before the grand jury.

Previous leak investigations had ended in failure after reporters refused to cooperate with officials, saying they needed to protect sources to do their work.

But Mr. Fitzgerald's tactics, with the support of the courts, changed the landscape of reporter-source relations in the capital and elsewhere.

"You could not bring this case without talking to reporters," Mr. Fitzgerald said. He said any prosecutors should regard the act of forcing reporters to discuss their conversations with sources as "a last resort in unusual circumstances."

This case fit that description he said because the reporters were witnesses to Mr. Libby's crimes, and "we do not think that what Mr. Libby was telling reporters was whistle-blowing."

Mr. Wilson, who has frequently expressed outrage over the leak of the identity of his wife, who is also known as Valerie Plame, said Tuesday that he thought the news media had behaved badly in the whole episode.

"I think one of the subplots in this whole trial was how the press was used and abused by this administration," Mr. Wilson said in a conference call with reporters.

He said reporters had been used to deceive people about the reasons for going to war and then to harm his wife's career by blowing her cover.

The convictions were based on Mr. Libby's statements to the grand jury about his conversations with Mr. Russert and Mr. Cooper, as well as Mr. Libby's statements to the F.B.I. about Mr. Russert.

The jury acquitted Mr. Libby on one count charging him with making a false statement to the bureau about his conversation with Mr. Cooper.

Kirby D. Behre, a Washington lawyer and sentencing expert, said the sentencing guidelines suggested a term of about two years, whether Mr. Libby had been convicted on one or all five counts.

Libby's Conviction In CIA Leak Case A Setback For White House (LAT)

By Richard B. Schmitt And Greg Miller, Times Staff Writers

The Los Angeles Times, March 7, 2007

The former aide to Cheney is found guilty of lying about his role in discrediting a war critic.

WASHINGTON — The guilty verdicts Tuesday against former vice presidential aide I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby made him the first high-level White House official convicted of a crime since the Iran-Contra scandal 20 years ago, and marked the latest fallout from the administration's handling of the run-up to the war in Iraq.

Libby, former chief of staff to Vice President Dick Cheney, was found guilty by a jury on four of five counts of perjury and obstruction of justice and faces a maximum of 25 years in prison. But because of federal sentencing guidelines, he is expected to get much less — perhaps two years. In addition, Libby could be fined as much as $250,000 for each guilty count.

Sentencing is set for June 5.

Libby remains free on a personal recognizance bond, and his lawyer said he would appeal. "We have every confidence that ultimately Mr. Libby will be vindicated," said Theodore V. Wells Jr. "We believe that he is totally innocent, and we intend to keep fighting."

Special Prosecutor Patrick J. Fitzgerald said he was gratified by the jury's verdict. "Any lie under oath is serious," he said. "It's obviously a serious matter in a case where there's a national security investigation."

Libby was charged with lying to investigators about his role in a White House campaign to discredit a critic of the administration — an effort that led to the exposure of the critic's wife, CIA operative Valerie Plame.

One juror said the panel did not believe Libby's claim that he learned of Plame's identity from a journalist, when evidence showed he had discussed her in several White House meetings before that.

"The primary thing that convinced us was his conversation with [NBC newsman Tim] Russert," said Denis Collins, speaking for the 11-person panel. Collins said Libby was told nine times about Plame before he talked to Russert.

The verdicts Tuesday appeared to close the book on the CIA leak case, in which no one was ever charged with the crime of exposing Plame. Fitzgerald said he did not expect to file additional charges.

"We're all going back to our day jobs," he said.

The conviction of such a high-ranking White House official was one more setback for the Bush administration, already laboring under low approval ratings, public impatience with the war in Iraq and a new Democratic majority in Congress.

Democrats immediately used the verdicts to lambaste the White House.

DOJ_NMG_0141458

"It's about time someone in the Bush administration has been held accountable for the campaign to manipulate intelligence and discredit war critics," said Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.).

Reid and other Democrats also issued preemptive warnings against the possibility of a presidential pardon for Libby. "President Bush should now pledge that he will not pardon Scooter Libby," said Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.).

At the White House, Deputy Press Secretary Dana Perino said President Bush "respected the jury's verdict and was saddened for Scooter Libby and his family." Vice President Dick Cheney said he was "very disappointed" with the verdict, and lauded Libby's "many years of public service."

The verdict is bound to fuel further debate over the wisdom of prosecuting government officials for leaking information to reporters.

Such investigations have failed in the past because prosecutors have been unable to get the cooperation of the journalists receiving the leaks. Fitzgerald subpoenaed reporters for their testimony, putting one of them, then-New York Times correspondent Judith Miller, in jail for 85 days until she agreed to talk about Libby.

Fitzgerald justified the tactics because of the gravity of the potential crime and the possibility that the unmasking of a CIA operative would lead to a breach in national security.

The judgment of the 11-member Libby jury — reduced from 12 after a retired museum curator was dismissed last week for having unauthorized contacts about the case — came on the 10th day of deliberations and after a month of testimony.

Stoic reaction

Seated at the defense table between his two primary attorneys, Libby displayed little emotion as the verdict was read just after noon. When the first "guilty" was uttered by the jury forewoman, Libby blinked rapidly but otherwise maintained a blank face. After the full verdict was rendered, Libby turned toward his wife, Harriet Grant, with a stoic smile.

Grant, who sat in the front row throughout the trial, had a more visible reaction, bowing her head as her husband was declared guilty on multiple counts, and dabbing at her eyes with a tissue. Later, she embraced several of the lawyers on Libby's team.

The trial was the first of a senior White House official in more than a decade, and the first conviction since national security advisor John M. Poindexter and former Marine Lt. Col. Oliver L. North were convicted for their involvement in the Iran-Contra arms-for-hostages affair in the 1980s. Both verdicts were later thrown out on appeal.

"A conviction at that high level within the White House is almost unheard of in our history," said Guy Singer, a former Justice Department prosecutor who specialized in public corruption cases, including the conviction of Republican lobbyist Jack Abramoff. "It is exceedingly rare that a prosecution is initiated, let alone concluded, at this level. For such a high-ranking member to be convicted of obstructing justice is really astounding."

The verdict was a measure of vindication for Fitzgerald, whose three-year probe into the unmasking of Plame drew complaints that he was straying far from his charge of finding out who leaked her identity to the public.

Libby was neither the first nor the only administration official who discussed Plame with reporters; Collins, the jury spokesman, said that for a time during the deliberations, there was a concern that Libby was being made a "fall guy."

Fitzgerald said the seriousness of the lies more than justified the prosecution of Libby. "We could not walk away from that," Fitzgerald said to reporters on the courthouse steps. "It's inconceivable that any responsible prosecutor could walk away and say, 'There's nothing there.' "

The lone count on which the jury acquitted Libby dealt with whether he had lied to the FBI about a conversation he had with then-Time magazine correspondent Matthew Cooper. Cooper testified that Libby had been a confirming source for a story he had written about Plame and Wilson for the magazine's website.

Collins, himself a former Washington Post reporter, said the jury had doubts about that charge because Cooper did not have any notes about the conversation and because there was no evidence that he had shared the information with his editors.

The guilty verdicts could have lasting political implications. An appeal will probably take a year to 18 months, remaining in the news during the 2008 presidential campaign.

Some observers expect that Libby's supporters, who have raised more than $3.5 million in a legal defense fund, will turn their efforts to securing a presidential pardon.

Legal experts said that under federal sentencing guidelines, Libby faced a sentence in the range of 21 to 27 months in prison, which could go higher depending on whether the prosecution urges a stiffer penalty.

"If the government wants to go full-court press, they could argue … in the range of five to seven years, and maybe more," said Douglas Berman, a sentencing expert and professor at Ohio State University's law school. The guidelines, he said, allow for a sentence to be augmented when a defendant is convicted of covering up a serious crime, which in the case of Libby involved the possible disclosure of classified information.

DOJ_NMG_0141459

He said that a new federal law gave victims the right to be involved in the sentencing process. That could mean that Plame, who retired from the CIA after her cover was blown, could be a witness at sentencing proceedings.

Civil suit awaits

Plame and her husband, former envoy Joseph C. Wilson IV, have filed a civil lawsuit against Libby, Cheney and others, alleging they violated the couple's constitutional rights by publicly disclosing her identity. In a prepared statement issued by their lawyers Tuesday, they said they believed the verdict and findings of the criminal trial would bolster the private suit.

"What happened today just reaffirmed that nobody is above the law," Wilson said in a phone interview. "In addition to everything else — destroying her career and the personal inconvenience of being maligned — this was a case of somebody betraying American national security secrets."

Wilson said that he was informed of the verdict in a phone call from his wife, who said simply: "Four counts guilty." She was not available for comment

Tuesday's verdict capped off an intrigue that began with a single sentence, which Bush uttered in his January 2003 State of the Union address, declaring that Saddam Hussein had recently sought nuclear material in Africa.

The statement drew the attention of Wilson, who had been sent by the CIA to Africa in February 2002 to assess the claim about Iraq; he had found it baseless.

Wilson began speaking to reporters, and went public on July 6, 2003, accusing the administration in a New York Times op-ed piece of twisting the prewar intelligence. Eight days later, his wife, and her connection to the CIA, were disclosed by syndicated columnist Robert Novak.

Libby, the only person charged in the ensuing investigation, was indicted in October 2005, accused of covering up his participation in the pushback against Wilson. His lawyers argued that he did not lie but may have misspoken to investigators because he was immersed in his work.

But the trial exposed how both Libby and Cheney were intensely focused on Wilson and his criticism, and how Wilson's wife became an important part of the administration story line.

Top CIA and State Department officials testified that they had told Libby that Plame worked for the CIA. Former White House Press Secretary Ari Fleischer testified that Libby had shared the information with him in hushed tones at a private lunch in the White House mess. NBC's Russert also took the stand, and denied that he ever spoke with Libby about Plame.

According to Fitzgerald, Libby panicked when he realized he may have broken the law by talking to reporters about Plame. So he invented a story that he was simply passing along information he had heard from other reporters, which would not be a crime.

"The sad truth is when people lie," Fitzgerald said during his closing argument, "it looks dumb when they are caught."

rick.schmitt@latimes.com
greg.miller@latimes.com

*

(INFOBOX BELOW)

Timeline

--

The Libby jurors focused on evidence and testimony about events that began unfolding during the opening months of the U.S.-led war in Iraq:

*

2003

Jan. 28: President Bush says in his State of the Union address: "The British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa."

May 6: New York Times columnist Nicholas D. Kristof reports that a former ambassador, whom he does not name, was sent to Niger in 2002 and had reported to the CIA and State Department well before Bush's speech that the uranium story was unequivocally wrong.

May 29: Libby asks Marc Grossman, an undersecretary of State, for information about the ambassador's trip to Niger. Grossman later tells Libby that Joseph C. Wilson IV was the former ambassador.

June 11 or 12: Grossman tells Libby that Wilson's wife works at the CIA.

June 12: Vice President Dick Cheney advises Libby that Wilson's wife works at the CIA.

June 23: Libby meets with New York Times reporter Judith Miller. During the meeting, Miller says, Libby tells her that Wilson's wife may work at a bureau of the CIA. Libby denies saying that.

July 6: The New York Times publishes an opinion piece by Wilson under the headline "What I Didn't Find in Africa."

DOJ_NMG_0141460

July 8: Columnist Robert Novak interviews Deputy Secretary of State Richard L. Armitage, who tells him that Wilson's wife works for the CIA.

July 10: Libby calls NBC newsman Tim Russert to complain about a colleague's news coverage. At the end of the conversation, Libby says, Russert tells him that "all the reporters know" that Wilson's wife works at the CIA. Libby says he was surprised to hear that. Russert denies saying it.

July 14: Novak reports that Wilson's wife is a CIA operative and that two senior administration officials, whom Novak does not name, said she suggested sending her husband to Niger.

Sept. 26: A criminal investigation is authorized to determine who leaked Valerie Plame's identity to reporters. A short time later, Armitage tells investigators he may have inadvertently leaked her identity to Bob Woodward of the Washington Post.

Oct. 14 and Nov. 26: Libby is interviewed by FBI agents.

2004

January: A grand jury begins investigating possible violations of federal criminal laws.

March 5 and March 24: Libby testifies before the grand jury. Libby tells jurors that he forgot the information about Plame working for the CIA until he heard it from Russert.

2005

Oct. 28: Libby is indicted on five counts: obstruction of justice and two counts each of false statement and perjury.

2006

Sept. 7: Armitage admits he leaked Plame's identity to Novak and Woodward, saying he did not realize Plame was a covert operative.

*

Source: Associated Press

*

I. Lewis `Scooter' Libby

Age: 56

Birthplace: New Haven, Conn.

Education: B.A., Yale University, 1972; J.D., Columbia University, 1975

Career: Entered government in 1981 with the State Department as a member of the policy planning staff. During the George H.W. Bush administration, he was confirmed by the Senate as deputy undersecretary of Defense for policy.

He was chief of staff to Vice President Dick Cheney and assistant to the vice president for national security affairs from 2001 until resigning in October 2005 after he was indicted on charges related to the investigation into the leak of Valerie Plame's identity to the media. Libby is also a senior advisor at the Washington-based Hudson Institute.

Family: Wife, Harriet Grant; two children

*

Source: Marquis Who's Who

Graphics reporting by Scott Wilson

*

Guilty on four of five counts

I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby was found guilty on four of five charges:

Perjury: For lying about his conversation with NBC journalist Tim Russert. | Perjury: For lying about conversations with other reporters.| Making a false statement: To the FBI about a conversation with Russert. | Obstruction of justice: For intentionally deceiving a grand jury investigating the

exposure of Valerie Plame as a CIA operative. | Making false statements: To the FBI about conversations with then-Time magazine reporter Matthew Cooper.

Libby Found Guilty In CIA Leak Trial (AP)

By Michael J. Sniffen And Matt Apuzzo

AP, March 7, 2007

Once the closest adviser to Vice President Dick Cheney, I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby was convicted Tuesday of lying and obstructing a leak investigation that shook the top levels of the Bush administration.

Four guilty verdicts ended a seven-week CIA leak trial that focused new attention on the Bush administration's much-criticized handling of intelligence reports about weapons of mass destruction in the run-up to the Iraq war.

In the end, jurors said they did not believe Libby's main defense: that he hadn't lied but merely had a bad memory.

DOJ_NMG_0141461

Their decisions made Libby the highest-ranking White House official convicted in a government scandal since National Security Adviser John Poindexter in the Iran-Contra affair two decades ago.

The case cost Cheney his most trusted adviser, and the trial revealed Cheney's personal obsession with criticism of the war's justification.

Trial testimony made clear that President Bush secretly declassified a portion of the prewar intelligence estimate that Cheney quietly sent Libby to leak to Judith Miller of The New York Times in 2003 to rebut criticism by ex-ambassador Joseph Wilson. Bush, Cheney and Libby were the only three people in the government aware of the effort.

More top reporters were ordered into court — including Miller after 85 days of resistance in jail — to testify about their confidential sources among the nation's highest-ranking officials than in any other trial in recent memory.

Special Prosecutor Patrick Fitzgerald said the verdict closed the nearly four-year investigation into how the name of Wilson's wife, Valerie Plame, and her classified job at the CIA were leaked to reporters in 2003 — just days after Wilson publicly accused the administration of doctoring prewar intelligence. No one will be charged with the leak itself, which the trial confirmed came first from then-Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage.

"The results are actually sad," Fitzgerald told reporters after the verdict. "It's sad that we had a situation where a high-level official person who worked in the office of the vice president obstructed justice and lied under oath. We wish that it had not happened, but it did."

One juror, former Washington Post reporter Denis Collins, said the jury did not believe Libby's main defense: that he never lied but just had a faulty memory. Juror Jeff Comer agreed.

Collins said the jurors spent a week charting the testimony and evidence on 34 poster-size pages. "There were good managerial type people on this jury who took everything apart and put it in the right place," Collins said. "After that, it wasn't a matter of opinion. It was just there."

Libby, not only Cheney's chief of staff but also an assistant to Bush, was expressionless as the verdict was announced on the 10th day of deliberations. In the front row, his wife, Harriet Grant, choked out a sob and her head sank.

Libby could face up to 25 years in prison when sentenced June 5, but federal sentencing guidelines will probably prescribe far less, perhaps one to three years. Defense attorneys said they would ask for a retrial and if that fails, appeal the conviction.

"We have every confidence Mr. Libby ultimately will be vindicated," defense attorney Theodore Wells told reporters. He said that Libby was "totally innocent and that he did not do anything wrong."

Libby did not speak to reporters.

The president watched news of the verdict on television at the White House. Deputy press secretary Dana Perino said Bush respected the jury's verdict but "was saddened for Scooter Libby and his family."

In a written statement, Cheney called the verdict disappointing and said he was saddened for Libby and his family, too. "As I have said before, Scooter has served our nation tirelessly and with great distinction through many years of public service."

Wilson, whose wife left the CIA after she was exposed, said, "Convicting him of perjury was like convicting Al Capone of tax evasion or Alger Hiss of perjury. It doesn't mean they were not guilty of other crimes."

Libby was convicted of one count of obstruction of justice, two counts of perjury to the grand jury and one count of lying to the FBI about how he learned Plame's identity and whom he told.

Libby learned about Plame from Cheney in June 2003 about a month after Wilson's allegations were first published, without his name, by New York Times columnist Nicholas Kristof.

Prosecutors said Libby relayed the Plame information to other government officials and told reporters, Miller of the Times and Matt Cooper of Time magazine, that she worked at the CIA.

On July 6, 2003, Wilson publicly wrote that he had gone to Niger in 2002 and debunked a report that Iraq was seeking uranium there for nuclear weapons and that Cheney, who had asked about the report, should have known his findings long before Bush cited the report in 2003 as a justification for the war. On July 14, columnist Robert Novak reported that Wilson's wife worked at the CIA and she, not Cheney, had suggested he go on the trip.

When an investigation of the leak began, prosecutors said, Libby feared prosecution for disclosing classified information so he lied to investigators to make his discussions appear innocent.

Libby swore that he was so busy he forgot Cheney had told him about Plame, and was surprised to learn it a month later from NBC reporter Tim Russert. He swore he told reporters only that he learned it from other reporters and could not confirm it.

Russert, however, testified he and Libby never even discussed Plame.

Libby blamed any misstatements in his account on flaws in his memory.

He was acquitted of one count of lying to the FBI about his conversation with Cooper.

Collins said jurors agreed that on nine occasions during a short period of 2003, Libby was either told about Plame or told others about her.

DOJ_NMG_0141462

"If I'm told something once, I'm likely to forget it," Collins recalled one juror saying. "If I'm told it many times, I'm less likely to forget it. If I myself tell it to someone else, I'm even less likely to forget it."

Libby is free pending sentencing. His lawyers will ask that he remain so through any appeal.

The prospects of a presidential pardon remain unclear. Top Democrats called on Bush to pledge not to pardon Libby; the White House did not say what the president would do.

___

Associated Press writer Natasha T. Metzler contributed to this report.

Libby Found Guilty In CIA Leak Case (FT)

By Caroline Daniel

Financial Times, March 7, 2007

Lewis "Scooter" Libby, the former chief of staff to Dick Cheney, the US vice-president, was convicted on Tuesday on four of five counts of perjury and obstruction of justice.

Mr Libby, 56, looking ashen but resolute, showed no emotion as the jurors each solemnly spoke the single word "guilty" over and over again on the four separate counts. They related to lies Mr Libby told a grand jury about his role in revealing the identity of a CIA agent. The jury, who had deliberated for 10 days, acquitted him on one charge of making false statements to the FBI.

Patrick Fitzgerald, the special prosecutor, speaking from the courtroom steps after the verdict, said: "Any lie under oath is serious. The truth is what drives the justice system." He called it "sad that there was a situation where someone in the vice-president's office lied under oath".

The verdict – and the evidence that emerged during the trial – is a blow to the reputation of the Bush administration. The trial heard evidence that White House officials and the vice-president's office leaked the name of Valerie Plame, a CIA agent.

Prosecutors claimed that they did so in retaliation for remarks by her husband, Joseph Wilson, a former ambassador, who disputed intelligence about Iraq's nuclear ambitions in a New York Times opinion piece.

Mr Fitzgerald was appointed to investigate the leaking of the name of Ms Plame to reporters. He did not charge anyone with that initial crime and her covert status was not an issue during the trial. However, Mr Fitzgerald said on Tuesday that he was "100 per cent confident that she was classified".

Theodore Wells, Mr Libby's defence lawyer, said he would file a motion for a new trial. "We have every confidence he will be vindicated. He is totally innocent," said Mr Wells.

Mr Libby could face up to 20 years in prison. However, his conviction raises the prospect that President George W. Bush might decide to grant a pardon to save the man who Mr Cheney called "one of the more honest men I know". Senator Edward Kennedy called on Mr Bush to pledge that he would not issue a pardon.

Democrats moved swiftly to place the verdict as part of a wider narrative about how the administration had smeared war critics, rather than the actions of one individual. Nancy Pelosi, the House speaker, said officials had shown a "callous disregard" for national security information and a "disposition to smear critics of the war in Iraq", while Mr Kennedy said officials concealed efforts to "vilify anyone who spoke the truth about the flaws in their justification for war".

Although during the trial Mr Fitzgerald said that there was "a cloud" over Mr Cheney, he said on Tuesday he did not intend to file any further charges.

The trial confirmed that officials, including Richard Armitage, the former deputy secretary of state, and Karl Rove, the chief political adviser to Mr Bush, also leaked the name.

Mr Libby's lawyers said he had been made the scapegoat by the White House.

Denis Collins, a juror, said: "There was tremendous sympathy for Mr Libby. We spent a lot of our time saying, 'What are we doing here with Mr Libby? Where's Rove?' "

Libby Found Guilty In CIA Leak Case (WP)

By Carol D. Leonnig And Amy Goldstein

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

A federal jury convicted I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby yesterday of lying about his role in the leak of an undercover CIA officer's identity, culminating a four-year legal saga that transfixed official Washington and revealed the inner workings of the White House and the media.

After 10 days of deliberations, the 11 jurors found Vice President Cheney's former chief of staff guilty of four felony counts of making false statements to the FBI, lying to a grand jury and obstructing a probe into the leak of Valerie Plame's identity. The

DOJ_NMG_0141463

jury acquitted him of one count of lying to the FBI about his conversation with a Time magazine reporter. Libby is the highest-ranking White House official to be convicted of a felony since the Iran-contra scandal nearly two decades ago.

Under federal sentencing guidelines, Libby faces a possible prison term of 1 1/2 to three years, but U.S. District Judge Reggie B. Walton will have wide latitude when he imposes his sentence on June 5. Defense attorneys said they will ask the presiding judge for a new trial or appeal the conviction. The White House declined to comment on the possibility of a pardon.

"We believe, as we said at the time of his indictment, that he is totally innocent, totally innocent, and that he did not do anything wrong," said attorney Theodore Wells Jr. "And we intend to keep fighting to establish his innocence."

Special Counsel Patrick J. Fitzgerald said on the courthouse steps that he felt "gratified" that the jury agreed with the government's case.

"The results are actually sad," he said. "It's sad that we had a situation where a high-level official, a person who worked in the office of the vice president, obstructed justice and lied under oath. We wish that it had not happened, but it did."

One juror, Denis Collins, said he and fellow jurors had little doubt after reviewing the evidence that Libby could not have forgotten how he learned Plame's identity -- the core of the defense's argument.

"It just seemed very unlikely he would have forgotten that. There were just so many things," said Collins, a writer who worked as a Washington Post reporter in the 1980s. "That he could remember that fact on a Tuesday and forget it on a Thursday . . . didn't make sense."

Libby, 56, was the only person charged in an unprecedented leak investigation that led to the questioning of Cheney and President Bush, though neither testified at the trial. Fitzgerald set out in December 2003 to answer a central question: Did anyone in the administration intentionally and illegally disclose Plame's classified status during the late spring and early summer of that year? At that time, several top officials were speaking to reporters, trying to rebut potent accusations from Plame's husband that the administration had twisted intelligence to justify war in Iraq.

Libby was not charged with the leak but with lying repeatedly to the FBI and a grand jury about how he learned about Plame's identity, and what he told reporters about her that spring and summer.

Libby has said that he forgot he learned about Plame from Cheney in June 2003, and that he believed he heard of her for the first time a month later from NBC's Tim Russert. He said he then shared the information with other reporters.

Fitzgerald said he does not expect to bring any more charges unless new information comes to light.

Plame's husband, former ambassador Joseph C. Wilson IV, publicly accused the White House of using flawed intelligence to justify the war and cited a CIA mission he took to Niger in 2002, which found no merit to claims that Iraq was trying to buy weapons-grade uranium. Plame's CIA identity was revealed in a syndicated column eight days later, with senior officials anonymously implying that Wilson's findings were not considered important because nepotism played a role in his assignment.

The trial highlighted the nation's divisions over the war, the Bush White House's intolerance of critics and the uneasy symbiosis between an elite tier of Washington journalists and their confidential sources inside the government.

It also portrayed Cheney as more intimately involved in the details of orchestrating the campaign to disparage Wilson than was previously known. At the grand jury, Libby testified that Cheney was "disturbed" by Wilson's assertions that he was sent on the mission as a result of a question from Cheney about an assessment that suggested Iraq was trying to purchase buy from Niger. The clear implication of Wilson's argument was that Cheney would have been told of his findings.

Indeed, according to evidence at trial, the CIA notified Cheney in early 2002 that it was launching a mission with an unnamed envoy to better answer his question about the Iraq-Niger connection. It is unclear whether the CIA later flagged Wilson's findings for the vice president.

Defense attorneys repeatedly indicated that they planned to call Libby and Cheney as witnesses in the trial. But the two never took the stand; defense lawyers said it was not wise for Libby to testify, and they did not call Cheney.

Cheney said in a statement yesterday that he is "very disappointed with the verdict."

"I am saddened for Scooter and his family," he said. "As I have said before, Scooter has served our nation tirelessly and with great distinction through many years of public service."

As the jury forewoman read each guilty count in a clear, solemn voice, Libby was impassive, remaining seated at the defense table, gazing straight ahead with hands crossed. He furrowed his brow after a second guilty count was read, then smiled frozenly as jurors individually affirmed the decision.

Libby's wife, Harriet Grant, sat in the front row with tears in her eyes and held tightly to a member of Libby's defense team. Later, she hugged each of Libby's lawyers and exchanged a few words with her husband.

Bush watched the verdict announcement on television in the Oval Office along with his chief of staff, Joshua B. Bolten, and counselor, Dan Bartlett.

DOJ_NMG_0141464

"He said that he respected the jury's verdict, that he was saddened for Scooter Libby and his family," spokeswoman Dana M. Perino said later. She declined to discuss a possible pardon for Libby as a "wildly hypothetical situation" and said the White House would not comment further because of Libby's efforts to seek a new trial.

Wilson, who with his wife has filed a civil lawsuit against Libby and several top administration officials alleging that they disclosed her identity, said yesterday the conviction shows that even a top White House official is subject to the American justice system.

"We're relieved that justice has been done," he said. "We see this as a reaffirmation that we are a nation of laws, we live in a democracy. The verdict shows no man is above the law."

Democratic leaders said Libby's conviction affirmed their concerns that the Bush administration had not told the truth about Iraq's potential threat to the United States and that it engaged in an unethical, no-holds-barred campaign against one man who questioned its assertions.

"Today's guilty verdicts are not solely about the acts of one individual," said House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (Calif.). "This trial provided a troubling picture of the inner workings of the Bush administration. The testimony unmistakably revealed -- at the highest levels of the Bush administration -- a callous disregard in handling sensitive national security information and a disposition to smear critics of the war in Iraq."

Legal experts said Fitzgerald had a powerful, narrowly drawn perjury case based on the facts unearthed in his investigation, while Libby's attorneys struggled from the start with a defense theory that statements he made repeatedly and in great detail to the FBI and the grand jury might not have been accurate.

"The indictment laid out a theory of deliberate lies that Fitzgerald was able to deliver almost flawlessly at trial," said Bill Lawler, a defense lawyer at Vinson & Elkins and a former federal prosecutor in Washington. But the defense, he said, "had to play the cards they were dealt."

"The biggest problem they had was their client was on the record repeatedly saying what the government thought were lies. There wasn't a lot of wiggle room," Lawler said.

The count that accused Libby of lying to the FBI about his conversation with then-Time magazine reporter Matthew Cooper troubled jurors for days. They asked the judge five questions about it as they deliberated, and they ultimately acquitted Libby of the charge.

Richard Sauber, Cooper's attorney, said he thinks jurors believed Cooper's testimony that Libby told him about Plame's CIA role in a July 12, 2003, phone call. Sauber cited the jury's decision to convict Libby on the charge of lying to the grand jury about that conversation.

But Sauber attributed the acquittal on the other false-statement charge to the jury's doubts about whether the FBI accurately described Libby's statements about his conversation with Cooper, something defense attorneys effectively called into question.

Staff writers Elizabeth Williamson, Peter Baker and Christopher Lee contributed to this report.

Libby Found Guilty On 4 Counts (WT)

By Jerry Seper

The Washington Times, March 7, 2007

A federal jury yesterday found former White House aide I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby Jr. guilty on four counts of perjury, obstruction of justice and lying to the FBI in an investigation into the leak of a CIA operative's identity.

After 10 days of deliberations, the former chief of staff to Vice President Dick Cheney was acquitted by a jury of seven women and four men on one count of lying to the FBI.

Libby, 56, is the only person charged in a case brought by Special Prosecutor Patrick J. Fitzgerald after a four-year investigation into the 2003 leak of CIA operative Valerie Plame's identity. Mrs. Plame is married to former Ambassador Joseph C. Wilson IV, who emerged in mid-2003 as an outspoken critic of the Bush administration's case for the war in Iraq.

U.S. District Judge Reggie B. Walton ordered a pre-sentencing report by May 15, which will be used to determine Libby's sentence. At sentencing on June 5, Libby faces up to 30 years in prison, although under federal sentencing guidelines he is expected to receive much less time.

Libby showed little reaction as the verdict was read and stood expressionless as the jury left the courtroom. His wife, Harriet Grant, sobbed as the verdict was read.

"We believe, as we said at the time of his indictment, that he is totally innocent, totally innocent, and that he did not do anything wrong," said Libby's attorney, Theodore Wells. "And we intend to keep fighting to establish his innocence."

DOJ_NMG_0141465

Mr. Wells said he will ask for a new trial and, failing that, will appeal the verdict. The defense team had said Libby recalled his conversations to the best of his ability and that any inaccurate statements he made to the FBI or the federal grand jury were the result of a faulty memory.

But Mr. Fitzgerald, who said no additional charges would be filed in the case, argued in court that Libby learned about Mrs. Plame from Mr. Cheney and other officials in June 2003 and relayed her name and CIA role to reporters.

"The results are actually sad," Mr. Fitzgerald said. "It's sad that we had a situation where a high-level official person who worked in the office of the vice president obstructed justice and lied under oath. We wish that it had not happened, but it did."

One of the jurors, Denis Collins, a former reporter for The Washington Post, said the jury felt "a tremendous amount of sympathy for Mr. Libby," adding that jurors asked each other on a number of occasions whether others should have been charged.

"What are we doing with this guy here? Where's Rove? Where are these other guys? I'm not saying we didn't think Mr. Libby was guilty of the things we found him guilty of. It seemed like he was, as Mr. Wells put it, he was the fall guy," Mr. Collins said.

He said jurors wanted to hear testimony from others involved in the case, including Bush political adviser Karl Rove, described as one of two sources for the original leak.

At the White House, Deputy Press Secretary Dana Perino said President Bush "respected the verdict" but was not going to comment on it. She said the president learned of the verdict from television and the White House rejected any characterization of it as embarrassing to the administration.

"I think that any administration that has to go through a prolonged news story that is unpleasant and one that is difficult when you're under the constraints and the policy of not commenting on an ongoing criminal matter that can be very frustrating," she said.

Mr. Cheney said he was "very disappointed" in the verdict and "saddened for Scooter and his family," adding that Libby "served our nation tirelessly and with great distinction through many years of public service." Because of continued litigation in the case, he said he would have "no further comment on the merits of this matter."

On Capitol Hill, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, California Democrat, said testimony during the trial "unmistakably revealed at the highest levels of the Bush administration a callous disregard in handling sensitive national security information and a disposition to smear critics of the war in Iraq."

She said the guilty verdicts were "not solely about the acts of one individual."

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, Nevada Democrat, said the trial "revealed deeper truths" about Mr. Cheney's role in the leak and called on Mr. Bush for a pledge "not to pardon Libby for his criminal conduct." He said it was "about time" someone in the Bush administration was held accountable "for the campaign to manipulate intelligence and discredit war critics."

A grand jury indictment named Libby on two counts of perjury, two counts of lying to the FBI and one count of obstruction of justice. He was accused of leaking Mrs. Plame's CIA role to reporters after Mr. Wilson disputed Mr. Bush's 2003 State of the Union address justifying the war in Iraq.

Mr. Wilson took two trips to the Republic of Niger to investigate accusations that Iraq had purchased or was in the process of buying uranium yellowcake, reporting that he found no evidence to support the claims.

But questions have since been raised on Mr. Wilson's statements that Mr. Cheney's office had requested he be sent to Niger, whether Mr. Cheney and other senior White House aides were briefed on his report, whether the report was conclusive and significant, and who suggested he travel to Niger.

Mrs. Plame's CIA role was revealed in a July 14, 2003, article by syndicated columnist Robert Novak eight days after Mr. Wilson wrote an article for the New York Times saying the Bush administration ignored intelligence on Iraq to justify the war.

S.A. Miller and Jon Ward contributed to this report.

In CIA Leak Trial, Libby Found Guilty (CSM)

By Linda Feldmann

The Christian Science Monitor, March 7, 2007

At an already difficult time for the Bush administration, the felony conviction of a former top aide to Vice President Cheney has cast a pall over the White House.

I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby, Mr. Cheney's onetime chief of staff, was convicted Tuesday on four of the five counts he faced involving perjury, obstruction of justice, and lying to the FBI during a federal investigation into the suspected leak of a covert CIA agent's identity.

DOJ_NMG_0141466

Whether that CIA employee, Valerie Plame, was in fact a covert operative at the time her identity was publicly revealed in a 2003 column by Robert Novak remains a matter of dispute. Ms. Plame and her husband, former Ambassador Joseph Wilson, believe it was and are suing Libby, Cheney, and presidential aide Karl Rove in civil court.

On the criminal counts, Mr. Libby faces up to 25 years in prison, and will be sentenced on June 5. However, the former official is expected to receive a shorter sentence, under federal sentencing guidelines, and will not be required to report to prison pending further legal action. Libby's legal team is requesting a new trial by April 13, and if denied, will appeal Tuesday's verdict.

The guilty verdicts, which were announced in the 10th day of jury deliberations, came as yet another blow to a White House struggling to turn around the central project of its six-year tenure, the Iraq war. On news websites Tuesday afternoon, the headline on Libby appeared near other stories on dozens of Shiite pilgrims killed Tuesday in Iraq.

Though the Libby trial centered on whether the aide had committed perjury and obstruction of justice during a federal investigation, the Iraq war – and the role of the vice president's office in defending the Bush administration's actions in it – provided the backdrop.

The Plame investigation sprang from a 16-word sentence in President Bush's 2003 State of the Union address, in which he stated that Iraq was attempting to purchase uranium from Africa. In July 2003, Ambassador Wilson wrote a column stating that he had found no evidence of such Iraqi attempts and accused the Bush administration of twisting intelligence to justify going to war in Iraq.

According to the argument laid out against Libby by special prosecutor Patrick Fitzgerald, Cheney's office – and Libby in particular – swung into action to discredit Wilson. Libby's defense team argued that the senior aide did not deliberately make false statements under oath, but rather was a very busy man who could not be expected to remember everything he had said and to whom and when.

After the trial, jurors speaking for the cameras made clear that they believed the Wilson matter and his harsh criticism of the Iraq war were a central concern in Cheney's office and that Libby's claims of memory problems were not credible. Still, one juror said he and his fellow jurors agreed with the defense argument that Libby had been hung out to dry by Mr. Rove and other more senior officials.

"It seemed like ... he was the fall guy," juror Denis Collins said in an ad hoc press conference after the verdict. But, he added, that point did not negate Libby's actions.

Libby's criminal conviction represents a rare moment in American history, the conviction of someone for actions taken during their time as a White House official. Over the years, top administration officials have been indicted, and most of them acquitted, but the last time a White House official was found guilty was during the Iran-contra scandal of the Reagan administration.

"This is just another blow to the Bush administration," says Cal Jillson, a political analyst at Southern Methodist University in Dallas. "If it were alone, it wouldn't amount to that much. But it comes with circumstances in Iraq, and the Walter Reed [scandal on treatment of Iraq and Afghan war veterans] feeding into the Katrina sense of an administration not caring."

The Libby news also comes amid new polling data showing Bush's job approval ratings down in the low 30s, Dr. Jillson notes. In the latest Gallup poll, 59 percent of Americans called sending US troops to Iraq a mistake, the highest such figure since September 2005.

Before the Libby verdict, public speculation had centered on the possibility that a conviction might embolden Mr. Fitzgerald to pursue legal action against Cheney himself. During his closing arguments, Fitzgerald spoke of a "cloud over the vice president" and about how "they" – alluding to Libby and Cheney – were using the fact of Plame's CIA employment to try to discredit Wilson.

But Tuesday, speaking to reporters after the verdict, Fitzgerald called the investigation finished and said he had no plans to pursue any other officials, unless new facts came to light.

Another key institution embroiled in the Libby trial was the press, and in fact, it was testimony from NBC newsman Tim Russert that seemed to dig Libby's legal grave. Libby had claimed he learned of Plame's identity from Mr. Russert, but Russert testified that the two had never discussed Plame. Jurors later said they found Russert's testimony credible.

But Washington journalists are not cheering that Russert appeared the victor in head-to-head legal combat with Libby. For all the journalists involved in the case – including former New York Times reporter Judith Miller and former Time magazine correspondent Matthew Cooper – appearing on a witness stand, under oath, discussing conversations with usually confidential sources is not a welcome circumstance.

Democratic politicians, meanwhile, sought to turn the Libby verdict to political advantage.

"It's appalling to think that while President Bush had a high level team in place to sell the Iraq War and viciously smear its critics, it has not given that same attention to plan for postwar Iraq, providing the proper equipment for our troops or ensuring that

DOJ_NMG_0141467

our troops and veterans receive the care they deserve," said Democratic National Committee chairman Howard Dean in a statement.

Former White House Aide Libby Found Guilty On 4 Of 5 Charges (WSJ)

By Evan Perez, Jess Bravin And Kara Scannell

The Wall Street Journal, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON -- A federal jury convicted I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby, Vice President Cheney's former chief of staff, of obstruction of justice, perjury and lying to the FBI in an investigation that began with the leak into a CIA operative's identity but came to symbolize the fraught origin of the nation's entanglement in Iraq.

The jury, cut to 11 members after one juror was dismissed after being exposed to case-related information, found Mr. Libby guilty of four of the five counts he faced. He was acquitted of one charge of false statements. Sentencing for Mr. Libby was set for June 5. Immediately after the verdicts, Mr. Libby's lawyer declared plans to seek a new trial and, failing that, appeal the conviction. Should Mr. Libby remain free while such moves play out, he may be able to avoid jail while his advocates press the president for a pardon in the Bush administration's final weeks. (See related story1.)

White House spokeswoman Dana Perino said the president, who watched the verdict announced on television, "respected" the jury's decision and was "saddened for Scooter Libby and his family," but declined to comment on any aspect of the case. (See more reactions to the verdict3.)

But beyond any impact on Mr. Libby, the verdict represents another painful blow to a lame-duck White House struggling to marshal public support for an Iraq policy under assault from all angles.

President Bush's plan to add more than 20,000 soldiers to the force in Iraq has already been condemned by a House resolution and undercut by a troop drawdown announced by America's only major ally in the war, Britain. At home, revelations of substandard care for wounded soldiers at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, the nation's premier military hospital, has stoked public and congressional outrage.

Now, with a jury finding criminality at the highest levels of White House efforts to justify the war, the administration faced an almost insurmountable task in regaining support for the president's signature policy from a majority of the public.

In comments to journalists after the verdict, juror Denis Collins, a former newspaper reporter, said that jurors considered Mr. Libby a "fall guy," and were disappointed that others implicated in the scandal -- such as the president's political mentor, Karl Rove -- weren't held to answer.

Mr. Collins said that the least convincing argument made at the trial was that "Mr. Libby was working so hard that he could just forget everything. Our conclusion was, yeah, he worked hard and had some memory problems… But you don't forget what you know." He also said the war in Iraq was peripheral to the trial. "This wasn't about the war. It was about a trip to Niger to see if there was uranium."

In the end, he said, jurors felt sympathy for Mr. Libby and his family. "It's not like I would vote for Mr. Libby if he ran for office," Mr. Collins said, "but we all felt for him...the unpleasantness of passing judgment was palpable."

Asked about a pardon, the 57-year-old Washington resident, who identified himself as a Democrat, said, "Personally, I wouldn't be upset a bit."

The verdict caps a five-week trial that enthralled the nation's capital as current and former administration officials and famous journalists testified about a key period in the summer of 2003, when criticism began mounting over the Iraq invasion and the search for weapons of mass destruction that were never found.

Mr. Libby was indicted on five counts of perjury and obstruction of justice stemming from statements he made to Federal Bureau of Investigation agents and a grand jury looking into the public disclosure of the name of a Valerie Plame, a former Central Intelligence Agency operative who is married to a critic of the Bush administration, former U.S. Ambassador Joseph Wilson.

Although the Libby indictment described Ms. Plame's relationship with the CIA as classified, Special Prosecutor Patrick Fitzgerald never charged anyone with leaking her identity despite the fact that early into his three-year investigation, he knew the original source was Richard Armitage, the former deputy secretary of state.

Instead, Mr. Fitzgerald pursued perjury-related charges after concluding that some officials may have lied to him to cover up their role in outing Ms. Plame. Provoking criticism from various power centers in Washington, from allies of the Bush White House to major media organizations, Mr. Fitzgerald proceeded to interview Messrs. Bush and Cheney and summoned reporters before a grand jury to testify about conversations with confidential sources. That effort landed former New York Times reporter Judith Miller for 85 days in jail until she relented. Ms. Miller left the paper under withering criticism for dealings with Mr. Libby and for coverage some said had credulously hyped the administration's case for war.

DOJ_NMG_0141468

Once he indicted Mr. Libby, right-leaning activists and Mr. Libby's supporters portrayed Mr. Fitzgerald, who also is the Bush-appointed U.S. attorney in Chicago, as a prosecutor run amok.

In an unusual twist, the prosecution case depended heavily on the credibility of journalists who had fought tooth and nail, if ultimately unsuccessfully, to avoid revealing their sources and notes. Ms. Miller bolstered Mr. Fitzgerald's argument that Mr. Libby lied about learning about Ms. Plame during a phone call with Mr. Russert, the NBC television host, on July 10, 2003. Ms. Miller said Mr. Libby told her about Ms. Plame twice, well before the Russert phone call. Similarly, former White House Press Secretary Ari Fleischer, testifying under an immunity deal with prosecutors, said that Mr. Libby told him about Ms. Plame during a lunch meeting three days before the call with the NBC newsman. Mr. Russert himself testified he couldn't have told Mr. Libby about Ms. Plame because he didn't learn about it until he read a July 14 article by syndicated columnist Robert Novak.

Mr. Libby's defense, as put forth by a team of top-notch defense lawyers led by Theodore V. Wells Jr. and William Jeffress, was that he didn't intentionally lie, but rather had "mis-recollections" that he blamed on faulty memory. Indeed, Messrs. Wells and Jeffress fiercely questioned the memory of reporters and managed to shake at least some of them, most notably Ms. Miller, who finally acknowledged that she couldn't be certain she didn't learn about Ms. Plame from someone other than Mr. Libby.

The roots of the Libby case lie in a debate over use of intelligence in the buildup to the Iraq war. It began when Ms. Plame's husband, Mr. Wilson, complained privately to reporters and later in his own newspaper op-ed that the Bush administration had misused or ignored intelligence he gathered that cast doubt on Iraq's alleged efforts to obtain materials for weapons of mass destruction from Africa.

In July 2003, Mr. Wilson went public with his story of taking a CIA-sponsored trip to the African nation of Niger to check out claims of connections to Iraq's weapons program. In interviews and in an opinion article, he called into question Mr. Bush's use of intelligence related to Niger. In retaliation, prosecutors say, Mr. Libby and other officials sought to disclose Ms. Plame's identity to reporters, making the argument that her intelligence job was the only reason Mr. Wilson looked into Iraq's weapons efforts in the first place. Mr. Libby, in grand jury testimony played in court, argued that the trip to impoverished, landlocked Niger was a "boondoggle" akin to a lawyer going to Hawaii for a seminar that he could easily attend in his hometown.

The administration subsequently backed off the Niger claim. However, Mr. Libby told the grand jury in the case that he continued trying to leak selective portions of intelligence reports to journalists in order to portray the Niger-Iraq link as true, under orders from Mr. Cheney. Administration officials complained that Mr. Wilson was the one misusing his role in the intelligence process by talking publicly about his findings.

With the Democrats now the majority party in Congress, the verdict is likely to prompt further hearings likely to embarrass the administration. In particular, it raises the visibility of a long-delayed Senate Intelligence Committee report -- expected to be released within a month or so -- that will highlight the administration's supposed efforts to manipulate information about Iraq's nuclear weapon ambitions, among other issues. A Senate aide said the committee also will continue to examine "the manipulation of pre-war intelligence," including White House efforts like Mr. Libby's to discredit critics. The Senate Armed Services Committee also is seeking further interviews with Mr. Libby, among other administration officials.

The House Judiciary Committee has been beefing up its investigative staff, with an eye to exploring a range of possible abuses of executive authority by the White House. A congressional aide said recently that "it's going to snowball into bigger issues" such as the conduct of the war.

The focus of much of the attention likely will be Mr. Cheney himself, whose manipulation of classified information and of White House reporters alike during 2003 became perhaps the biggest revelation of Mr. Libby's trial.

In a statement, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, a Nevada Democrat, said, Lewis Libby has been convicted of perjury, but his trial revealed deeper truths about Vice President Cheney's role in this sordid affair."

--John D. McKinnon and John McCary contributed to this article.

Libby Verdict Will Echo For 2008 Republicans (POL)

By Mike Allen And Jeanne Cummings

Politico.com, March 7, 2007

Mary Matalin, a friend and former colleague of Lewis "Scooter" Libby, said she felt sick as she waited through 10 days of jury deliberations. And when he was declared guilty of four of five federal charges in the CIA leak case Tuesday, she had a one-word reaction: "Unspeakable."

Even an acquittal would have left deep scars on the George W. Bush presidency because of the immense publicity surrounding the case and its political fallout. But the guilty verdicts -- on one count of obstruction, two counts of perjury and one count of lying -- mean that the case remains an ugly and enduring part of the politics of President Bush's last two years in office.

DOJ_NMG_0141469

Ever since President Gerald R. Ford pardoned former President Richard M. Nixon for Watergate crimes, executive branch grants of immunity have become hot political footballs in presidential campaigns. And Libby's conviction seems destined to continue the trend, even if Bush ultimately doesn't pardon him.

As soon as the verdict was announced, Democrats began demanding a commitment from Bush not to issue a pardon for Libby, who theoretically could face 30 years in prison, but is likely to get a lesser sentence. The White House won't give such a commitment, of course, and Bush has said he won't even talk about it.

Democrats, nonetheless, are trying to start a drumbeat about the question, with the aim of painting Republicans as tainted by cronyism and raising voters' doubts about the GOP's trustworthiness.

Libby's fall raises three key questions that could play a material role in who succeeds the 43rd president, and how history treats him:

1. Will Bush pardon Libby?

Catching coverage of the verdict on a television in a small dining room off the Oval Office with Chief of Staff Joshua Bolten and Counselor Dan Bartlett, Bush said that he respected the jury's verdict and that he was saddened for Libby and his family, according to aides.

Libby's lawyers plan to ask for a new trial. So, the president and his spokesmen plan to cite an ongoing legal investigation as they refuse to comment on the possibility of a pardon. But that won't stop reporters from asking.

2. Was Libby the tip of the iceberg?

Denis Collins, the only juror who spoke outside the federal courthouse near the Capitol, said Libby struck him as a "fall guy," and testimony suggested he saw himself as the scapegoat for Cheney or senior Bush adviser Karl Rove.

"There was a tremendous amount of sympathy for Mr. Libby on the jury," Collins said as he described the jury's methodical approach. "It was said a number of times: What are we doing with this guy here? Where's Rove? Where's -- you know, where are these other guys?"

The Democrats who control Congress now can use their subpoena power to try to find out.

3. Does this make Bush more radioactive for the Republicans seeking the presidential nomination?

Democrats are already working to ensure that the Libby case, which dates to a Robert Novak column in July 2003, naming Valerie Plame as a CIA operative, resounds through November 2008.

House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.), looking ahead to congressional elections, said the Libby trial was "not solely about the acts of one individual," but produced evidence of "callous disregard" in handling sensitive national security information.

It's tough enough for the same party to win a third term in the White House, but almost impossible to do so if the nation has soured on the incumbent. While none of the top Republican contenders will face any direct fallout from the Libby guilty verdict, the decision is yet another blow against an already-wounded president and his Republican Party.

Combined with the devastating, and still unfolding, indictment about the treatment of wounded troops at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, the specter of the vice president's top aide facing a prison sentence will only worsen Bush's already historically low standing in the public opinion polls.

Aides to the leading Republican presidential contenders declined comment after the verdict was announced. But the Democratic hopefuls pounced. Sen. Barack Obama of Illinois said in a quick e-mailed statement that the conviction "underscores what happens when our foreign and national security policies are subverted by politics and ideology."

Former Sen. John Edwards of North Carolina called the outcome "an important step in holding the administration accountable for its consistent misuse and manipulation of intelligence to further its ideological agenda." He then posed a question that is likely to bedevil the administration and the GOP for the foreseeable future.

"There are serious questions about whether the buck actually stopped with Scooter Libby," he said. "The American people deserve to know if Mr. Libby has been made a scapegoat in order to protect anyone else."

John Bresnahan, Carrie Budoff and Jonathan Martin contributed to this report.

Libby's Backers Push For Pardon (WSJ)

By John D. Mckinnon, Evan Perez And Gary Fields

The Wall Street Journal, March 7, 2007

Conviction of Cheney Aide Sparks Conservative Calls, But Raises Stakes for 2008

The conviction of Vice President Cheney's former chief of staff, I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby, threatened to spark a new political battle, with some conservatives pushing for a presidential pardon based on what they claim is prosecutorial excess.

A Washington, D.C., federal jury spent nearly 10 days sifting a month of testimony before convicting Mr. Libby yesterday on four of the five counts he faced, in a case that started as an investigation into the leaking of the identity of a CIA official. (See related article.1)

Mr. Libby wasn't charged with leaking, but with perjury and obstruction of justice for comments he made to FBI investigators and a federal grand jury. His supporters have long argued he shouldn't have been tried since he wasn't the original leaker and say his inaccurate comments to investigators were misstatements based on a faulty memory. With the conviction, these backers are turning their efforts toward seeking a pardon.

Within hours of the verdict, the conservative National Review published an online editorial calling for a pardon and stating that the verdict "conclusively proved only one thing: A White House aide became the target of a politicized prosecution set in motion by bureaucratic infighting and political cowardice." The Wall Street Journal editorial page also called for a pardon2.

Other prominent Republicans also voiced support. "I would be more than happy to lend my name to the effort for a pardon if it came down to that -- I think it would be justified," said former Sen. Fred Thompson, a Tennessee Republican who has helped lead an effort to raise money for Mr. Libby's defense, including plans to host a new fund-raiser announced after yesterday's verdict.

Dana Perino, a White House spokeswoman, left the door open, saying "there's a process in place for all Americans if they want to receive a pardon from a president." She said she wasn't characterizing Mr. Libby's prospects for clemency if he does apply.

Anticipating the pardon push, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, a Nevada Democrat, urged President Bush to "pledge not to pardon Libby for his criminal conduct."

The vice president released only a short statement, saying, "I am very disappointed with the verdict."

Besides being a political risk for the president, a pardon could be a big headache for the Republican presidential nominee in 2008. But some Republicans predicted that the post-trial and appeals processes could drag on for some time, postponing any pardon of Mr. Libby by Mr. Bush until after the 2008 election. Mr. Libby's lawyers said yesterday they would seek a new trial, and pursue appeals if that fails.

Despite strongly believing Mr. Libby lied when he claimed faulty memory, some jurors felt bad about their decision, said Denis Collins, a former journalist who sat on the jury. Some were in tears afterward.

"There was a tremendous amount of sympathy on the jury for Mr. Libby," Mr. Collins said outside the courthouse afterward. "We said a number of times, 'What are we doing with this guy? Where's [presidential aide Karl] Rove? Where are the other guys?' He was the fall guy."

Asked about a pardon, the 57-year-old Washington resident, who identified himself as a registered Democrat, said, "Personally, I wouldn't be upset a bit."

The case began in the summer of 2003 amid mounting criticism over the Iraq invasion and the search for weapons of mass destruction that were never found. Government prosecutors argued that Mr. Libby was at the center of an administration campaign to discredit former Ambassador Joseph Wilson, a vocal war critic, leaking information to reporters, including the fact that Mr. Wilson's wife, Valerie Plame, worked at the Central Intelligence Agency. Prosecutors said Mr. Libby tried to cover up his involvement by lying to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a grand jury about his actions.

"The results are actually sad," Special Prosecutor Patrick Fitzgerald told reporters after the verdict. "It's sad that we had a situation where a high-level official person who worked in the office of the vice president obstructed justice and lied under oath. We wish that it had not happened, but it did."

In making their case for a pardon, supporters of Mr. Libby note that several other administration officials were involved in the leak as well. Richard Armitage, the former deputy secretary of state, has admitted being the original leaker, while political strategist Rove and Ari Fleischer, the former press secretary, also gave information about Ms. Plame to reporters.

"It's a case that never should have been brought," said Victoria Toensing, a former Justice Department official in the Reagan administration. "Politics should not be criminalized."

The prosecution aroused sympathy from prominent conservatives including former Bush adviser Mary Matalin, former Secretary of Education William Bennett and former CIA director R. James Woolsey. All lent their names to a private fund-raising trust that has so far has brought in more than $3 million to help pay for his defense.

Mr. Libby's handling of himself also is sure to score points with conservatives, as well as the White House. He could have done much more during the trial to embarrass the White House. At one point in his opening argument, Ted Wells, one of Mr. Libby's attorneys, suggested the defense would focus on how the White House had tried to make Mr. Libby a scapegoat in the case in order to spare Mr. Rove.

In the end, however, the defense rested without calling Mr. Libby or his former boss Mr. Cheney, and no more was said about White House scapegoating. That led some trial watchers to suggest Mr. Libby was being careful to preserve the pardon option.

DOJ_NMG_0141471

Some presidential pardons have been deeply controversial. President Clinton came under fierce criticism for pardoning fugitive financier Marc Rich, whose ex-wife was a major Democratic campaign contributor, just before leaving office in 2001. Ironically, Mr. Rich was represented at one point by Mr. Libby, then a high-powered Washington lawyer in private practice.

President Bush came into office amid congressional hearings and a federal investigation of Mr. Clinton's last-minute pardons and commutations. At an early news conference, Mr. Bush said he would be different. Of pardons, he said: "I'll have the highest of high standards."

President Bush has rarely exercised his pardoning authority, using it mostly on non-controversial cases. With less than two years left in office, he has pardoned 113 people. Among the seven presidents who have held the office at least seven years since 1897, Mr. Bush ranks last in his use of the pardon power in the first six years of his administration.

Of all 19 presidents who have held the office since 1897, only Mr. Bush's father, George H.W. Bush, pardoned fewer people overall, and he served just one term. Even Warren G. Harding, who died after 27 months in office, pardoned 300 people and Gerald Ford, who served 29 months, granted 382 pardons.

Some conservatives compare the Libby case to the Iran-Contra affair. The first President Bush pardoned former Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger and five others convicted in that case, arguing they had acted out of service to the country.

"That was really a vindication of his political people. They were doing their job to protect the presidency," said Margaret Colgate Love, a former pardon attorney with the Justice Department. "This case is not as serious, but there is a similar premise for issuing a pardon."

--John McCary and Kara Scannell contributed to this article.

Write to John D. McKinnon at john.mckinnon@wsj.com24, Evan Perez at evan.perez@wsj.com25 and Gary Fields at gary.fields@wsj.com26

President Bush Should Pardon I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby (NR)

National Review, March 7, 2007

The trial that concluded in a guilty verdict on four of five counts conclusively proved only one thing: A White House aide became the target of a politicized prosecution set in motion by bureaucratic infighting and political cowardice.

When partisans pounced on Bob Novak's July 14, 2003, revelation that the wife of administration critic Joe Wilson worked at the CIA, they adopted Wilson's paranoid persecution theory. Then a scandal-hungry media joined in. Novak's unidentified administration sources were widely accused of criminal wrongdoing: having "outed" a covert agent.

The alleged motive for the leak was to punish Joe Wilson, whose account of his mission to Niger supposedly unmasked the administration's manufactured case for the war in Iraq. The victim in this set piece was Valerie Plame Wilson, and the villains were Vice President Cheney, Karl Rove, and Scooter Libby.

From the very beginning of the ensuing spectacle, petty agendas subverted justice. The CIA, at war with the White House, and in particular with the vice president's office, referred the leak to the Justice Department, even though the agency certainly knew that there had been no criminal violation since Plame wasn't "covert." (According to the relevant statute, only the leak of a covert agent's identity is a criminal act.) The CIA's spokesman had also confirmed Plame's employment to Novak, without sounding any alarms over the revelation of classified information. The referral to Justice—leaked to the media—was the act of an agency more concerned with shifting the blame for faulty Iraq intelligence than with protecting a supposedly vulnerable agent.

With the matter in the Justice Department's lap, such critics as New York senator Charles Schumer demanded the appointment of a special prosecutor, claiming that then–attorney general John Ashcroft couldn't oversee the probe because he had a conflict of interest. Even though there was no evidence that the department's career prosecutors were unable to handle the case, Ashcroft and his top deputy, James Comey, quickly gave in to Schumer's demands. Comey appointed his friend in Chicago, Patrick Fitzgerald, as the special prosecutor, and gave him even more powers than the old independent counsels had.

None of this was a profile in courage on the administration's part, but the true insanity of the situation was withheld from the public until years later, when we learned that, long before the Justice Department had appointed Fitzgerald, it knew who had leaked to Novak. Early in the investigation, deputy secretary of state Richard Armitage informed investigators that he had told Novak about Mrs. Wilson (although he left out the fact that he had also leaked to the Washington Post's Bob Woodward). But like the savvy bureaucratic infighter that he is, Armitage kept quiet publicly, allowing the vice president's office to take the heat for something he had done.

So why did Fitzgerald go forward? Maybe someday he'll tell us, but we're not betting on it. Reasonable people can conclude that it was only Scooter Libby's imperfect memory—not willful deception—that gave rise to the charges of lying under oath and obstruction of justice. Among the supporting players—including CIA officials, Bob Novak, Woodward and Walter Pincus of the Washington Post, and Time's Matthew Cooper—no two participants in any conversation about Valerie Plame had the same recollection.

DOJ_NMG_0141472

Whatever his motivations, Fitzgerald adopted the discredited Wilson's script and focused his three-year investigation on Cheney, Libby, and Rove—and not, inexplicably, on others. Not on Armitage. Not on Ari Fleischer, either. The recent trial revealed that the former White House press secretary was granted immunity from prosecution, and that he admitted to telling two reporters about Plame's employment. Those reporters were never even questioned. Nor did any charges arise from Fleischer's faulty memory, even though a third reporter (Pincus) testified that Fleischer had told him too about Plame—something that Fleischer denied under oath.

There should have been no referral, no special counsel, no indictments, and no trial. The "CIA-leak case" has been a travesty. A good man has paid a very heavy price for the Left's fevers, the media's scandal-mongering, and President Bush's failure to unify his own administration. Justice demands that Bush issue a pardon and lower the curtain on an embarrassing drama that shouldn't have lasted beyond its opening act.

The Libby Travesty (WSJ)

The Wall Street Journal, March 7, 2007

The word "guilty" had barely crossed the airwaves yesterday in the perjury case of Scooter Libby before critics were calling it proof that President Bush "lied us into war" and demanding that Dick Cheney be strung up next. Maybe now Mr. Bush will realize that this case was always a political fight over Iraq and do the right thing by pardoning Mr. Libby.

The conviction is certainly a travesty of justice, though that is not the jury's fault. The 11 men and women were faced with confusing evidence of conflicting memories in a case that never should have been brought. In the end, they were persuaded more by prosecutor Patrick Fitzgerald's story line that Mr. Libby, a former aide to Mr. Cheney, had lied to a grand jury about what he knew when about the status of CIA official Valerie Plame, the wife of Bush critic Joseph Wilson.

In hindsight, the defense seems to have blundered by portraying Mr. Libby as the "fall guy" for others in the White House. That didn't do enough to rebut Mr. Fitzgerald's theory of the case, and so the jury seems to have decided that Mr. Libby must have been lying to protect something. The defense might have been better off taking on Mr. Fitzgerald for criminalizing political differences.

For that, in essence, is what this case is really all about. We learned long ago -- and Mr. Fitzgerald knew from the start of his probe in 2003 -- that Mr. Libby was not the source of the leak to columnist Robert Novak that started all this. Mr. Libby thus had no real motive to cover up this non-crime. What he did have strong cause to do was rebut the lies that Mr. Wilson was telling about the Administration and Mr. Cheney -- lies confirmed as lies by a bipartisan report of the Senate Intelligence Committee in 2004.

Mr. Libby did talk to some reporters about the Administration's case for war in 2003, and he did mention Ms. Plame in some cases. So the jury apparently decided that, when asked about those conversations by the FBI and grand jury, he had lied about his own sources of information about Joe Wilson and his wife. In other words, he has not been convicted of lying to anyone about the case for war in Iraq, or about Mr. Wilson or his wife.

Rather, he has been convicted of telling the truth about Mr. Wilson and Ms. Plame to some reporters but then not owning up to it. One tragic irony is that if Mr. Libby had only taken the Harold Ickes grand-jury strategy and said "I don't recall," he probably never would have been indicted. But our guess is that he tried to cooperate with the grand jury because he never really believed he had anything to hide. This may also explain why Mr. Libby never retained an experienced Beltway attorney until he was indicted.

None of this has stopped critics of the war from trying to blow this entire case into something far larger. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid hailed the conviction as proof that the White House tried to "manipulate intelligence and discredit war critics." But the charges against Mr. Libby had nothing to do with intelligence, and Mr. Wilson was himself so discredited by summer 2004 that the John Kerry campaign dropped him as a spokesman once the Senate exposed his deceit.

What Mr. Reid and others are doing is showing how much all this really has been about a policy dispute over Iraq. The fact that they are now demanding Mr. Cheney's head is further evidence of the political nature of this entire episode. But it should also be a warning to Mr. Bush and his advisers that they too bear much responsibility for Mr. Libby's conviction.

Rather than confront Mr. Wilson's lies head on, they became defensive and allowed a trivial matter to become a threat to the Administration itself. They allowed Attorney General John Ashcroft to recuse himself and Mr. Fitzgerald to be appointed even though Justice officials knew that Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage had been the first official to leak Ms. Plame's name to reporters. Mr. Libby got caught in the eddy not because he was dishonest but because he was a rare official who actually had the temerity to defend the President's Iraq policy against Mr. Wilson's lies.

As for the media, most of our brethren were celebrating the conviction yesterday because it damaged the Bush Administration they loathe. But they too will pay a price for holding Mr. Fitzgerald's coat. The Bush Administration will soon be

DOJ_NMG_0141473

history, but the damage Mr. Fitzgerald has done to the ability to protect media sources and to the willingness of government officials to speak openly to reporters will last far longer.

Mr. Bush will no doubt be advised to wait for the outcome of an appeal and the end of his Administration to pardon Mr. Libby. We believe he bears some personal responsibility for this conviction, especially for not policing the disputes and insubordination in his Administration that made this travesty possible. The time for a pardon is now.

The Case For A Libby Pardon (WSJ)

By Ronald D. Rotunda

The Wall Street Journal, March 7, 2007

Yesterday, a Washington, D.C. jury found former White House aide I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby guilty on four out of five counts in his trial for perjury and obstruction of justice.

This case began when the White House decided to launch a criminal investigation of who told reporter Robert Novak that Valerie Plame worked for the CIA, where she once held non-official cover status. The Constitution gives the president (according to the Supreme Court in U.S. v. Nixon) the "exclusive authority and absolute discretion to decide whether to prosecute a case."

But there is another power that the Constitution also commits to the president's unreviewable discretion. That is the pardon power, and it is just as important an exercise of executive authority. While post-trial motions or inevitable appeals may eventually overturn the jury verdict, there is no need for the president to wait. In the unusual circumstances of this case, a presidential pardon is appropriate.

That's because, as most people know by now, special prosecutor Patrick Fitzgerald never charged anyone with violating the Intelligence Identities Protection Act of 1982 -- the job for which the Department of Justice appointed him -- after he quickly determined that there was no violation of that law. And it is all but certain that, knowing what he knows now, the president would never have even started the process.

After Robert Novak wrote that Valerie Plame worked for the CIA, CIA Director George Tenet requested that the Justice Department start a criminal probe into the leak of Ms. Plame's identity. The CIA insisted that it was vital to discover the source, although Robert Novak said at the time that the CIA "never indicated it would endanger her or anybody else" if he revealed her connection.

What's more, Ms. Plame and her husband reacted to their "outing" in an unusual way. They appeared to revel in the publicity. I have worked with undercover FBI agents and Department of Defense officials whose jobs are classified. They do not pose for photo spreads in Vanity Fair. Unlike Ms. Plame, they do not have pictures of themselves in pajamas published in Time magazine.

The final nail in this case should have come when, right about the time of Mr. Fitzgerald's appointment, former Deputy Secretary of State Richard L. Armitage told the FBI that he was the primary source who revealed Ms. Plame's identity. Mystery solved! The circumstances did not show any violation of the Intelligence Identities Protection Act, so there could be no indictment. But rather than going home, Mr. Fitzgerald asked Messrs. Armitage and Novak to keep that information quiet. He also asked for and received approval to expand his investigation and he kept going -- like the Energizer Bunny.

The whole court case was about memories, not about the importance of classified information, or whether the government properly classified information in the first place. That is because Mr. Fitzgerald never charged anyone with the leak itself.

When the press asked him if Mr. Libby had "outed" Ms. Plame, he said, "I am not speaking to whether or not Valerie Wilson was covert." The original "crime," we now know, did not occur. Mr. Fitzgerald never even introduced any testimony that Ms. Plame's employment was classified.

The trial featured a parade of different memories. What did people say? Should Mr. Libby have remembered a conversation the same way NBC's Tim Russert did? For the crucial conversation, Mr. Russert kept no notes, and was not even sure what time of day the conversation took place. An F.B.I. report said that Mr. Russert said that he could not rule out discussing Ms. Plame with Mr. Libby, but he had no recollection of that. On the stand, Mr. Russert testified that he did not believe he had said that.

He was not alone. Other reporters had confused notes, had lost their notes, or could not remember all that well. Former New York Times reporter Judith Miller, who suffered jail for nearly three months until she disclosed her sources and notes, admitted that she had a weak memory, and testified that she had heard of Valerie Plame's CIA connection from sources other than Mr. Libby.

But if testimony differs, the law allows the jury to look witnesses in the eye and believe one and not the other, even if there is no documentary evidence. That is why perjury is a powerful prosecution tool -- one that was abused here.

DOJ_NMG_0141474

Among the unhappy precedents if the Libby verdict stands: Executive branch officials will hide from the press, which is unfortunate because "leaks" can be an important check on all three branches of government. And even innocent officials will not be forthcoming when it comes to cooperation with future prosecutors. ("I don't recall . . .")

Perhaps the worst precedent would be normalizing the criminalization of policy differences. Many of those who loudly demanded Mr. Fitzgerald's appointment -- and who applauded yesterday's verdict -- offered no more compelling reason than that somebody should pay for the Bush administration's decision to go to war in Iraq.

The late Supreme Court Justice Robert Jackson, when he was attorney general, warned that if the "prosecutor is obliged to choose his case, it follows that he can choose his defendants. Therein is the most dangerous power of the prosecutor: that he will pick people that he thinks he should get, rather than the cases that need to be prosecuted."

One wonders if Mr. Libby must go to prison for years to protect the principle that the classified status of a former CIA employee is sacrosanct, even if that employee appears to covet publicity.

Mr. Rotunda, a professor at George Mason University School of Law, was assistant majority counsel to the Senate Watergate Committee.

GOP: Verdict About Libby; Democrats Say It's Bigger (USAT)

By Richard Willing

USA Today, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON — Former vice presidential aide Lewis "Scooter" Libby became the highest-ranking Bush administration official to be convicted of a crime Tuesday when a jury found him guilty of perjury and obstruction.

The federal jury convicted Libby, 56, of four of five counts of lying to FBI agents and grand jurors during a probe into how the identity of a CIA officer, Valerie Plame, was leaked to reporters in 2003.

The conviction of Libby, Vice President Cheney's chief of staff until he resigned in 2005, could further burden a White House struggling with a 4-year-old war in Iraq and low poll ratings.

"Most Americans will see (the case) as something bigger, but when you get down to it, it was one case involving one guy," said Ed Gillespie, a former Republican Party chairman.

Democrats, including House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, said the verdict was about more than Libby. It showed the White House's "callous disregard in handling sensitive national security information and a disposition to smear critics of the war in Iraq," Pelosi said.

Libby faces up to 25 years in prison and a possible fine of $1 million. Federal sentencing guidelines permit a judge to sentence Libby to far less time. Sentencing is set for June 5.

Theodore Wells, Libby's chief defense attorney, said he will seek a new trial.

Special prosecutor Patrick Fitzgerald said he was pleased by the verdict. However, "it's sad that we had a situation where a high-level official … obstructed justice and lied under oath."

Libby was the only person charged after Fitzgerald's 22-month investigation.

AUDIO: Defense will seek new trial

The jury of seven women and four men reached their verdict after 10 days of deliberations. They heard 19 witnesses during 14 days of testimony. Libby's claims that he had forgotten many of his conversations about Plame and her CIA affiliation "were just hard to believe," juror Denis Collins said.

White House spokeswoman Dana Perino said President Bush "respected the jury's decision" but was "saddened" for Libby and his family.

Cheney, Libby's former boss, said he was disappointed by the verdict. "Scooter has served our nation tirelessly and with great distinction through many years of public service."

The saga that lead to Libby's conviction started with a July 14, 2003, column by Robert Novak. It named Plame as a "CIA operative" who helped send her husband, former ambassador Joseph Wilson, to the African nation of Niger to investigate claims Iraq had sought uranium there. Wilson had concluded the reports were likely baseless after a February 2002 trip to Niger.

On July 6, 2003, in a newspaper column and a television appearance, Wilson had accused the White House of misleading the nation about Iraq's nuclear program to justify the March 2003 U.S. invasion.

Dems To Bush: Don't Pardon Libby (HILL)

By Elana Schor

The Hill, March 7, 2007

DOJ_NMG_0141475

Democratic leaders yesterday called on President Bush to guarantee no pardon for Lewis "Scooter" Libby, hours after the former senior White House aide was convicted on four felony counts for lying to federal investigators who were looking into the leak of an undercover CIA officer's identity.

Vice President Dick Cheney, Libby's former boss, appeared before GOP senators at their weekly policy luncheon without addressing the jury's guilty verdict on four out of five counts of perjury, obstruction of justice and making false statements, according to several lawmakers present. Libby's legal team vowed to appeal, but Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) wasted no time in hailing the verdict and challenging the White House.

"It's about time someone in the Bush administration has been held accountable for the campaign to manipulate intelligence and discredit war critics," Reid said, adding that the trial "revealed deeper truths about Vice President Cheney's role in this sordid affair. Now President Bush must pledge not to pardon Libby for his criminal conduct."

The trial of Cheney's former chief of staff has provided much fuel for Democratic condemnation of the White House's conduct during the early days of the war in Iraq. The new congressional majority squared that circle yesterday, pushing Bush to hold Libby accountable by forgoing a pardon while depicting Libby as "the fall guy," in the words of one juror who spoke publicly after the verdict.

Senate Majority Whip Dick Durbin (D-Ill.) echoed Reid, urging Bush not to consider sparing Libby from the likely three-year prison sentence he faces.

"It sends a terrible message at a time when we are demanding accountability from the generals at Walter Reed … to suggest anyone in our government is above the law," Durbin said.

Democratic National Committee Chairman Howard Dean lent his voice to the chorus of demands for a presidential pledge not to pardon, citing Bush's 2003 vow to "take the appropriate action" against any White House employee found to be involved in the leak of an undercover agent's classified identity.

"While he failed to keep his promise to fire the leaker, he should pledge not to pardon Scooter Libby," Dean said in a statement.

Sen. Mary Landrieu (D-La.) also recalled Bush's 2003 comments, comparing the questions raised by the administration's revealing of undercover CIA officer Valerie Plame Wilson to the questions raised by the administration's response to Hurricane Katrina.

"It would be a serious mistake for the president" to pardon Libby, Landrieu said, "given the pattern of corruption and incompetence that have unfortunately become a hallmark of this administration."

Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) spoke on the verdict, agreeing with Reid on the need for a presidential pardon pledge. Pelosi remarked that testimony by former White House officials at the trial "unmistakably revealed … a callous disregard in handling sensitive national security information and a disposition to smear critics of the war in Iraq."

Sen. Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.), Democratic Caucus vice chairman, was the among the first lawmakers to ask for the appointment of a special prosecutor to investigate how the leak of Plame Wilson's name was tied to comments made by her husband, former ambassador Joseph Wilson IV, a critic of the Bush administration's original rationale for invading Iraq.

"The evidence in the trial made clear that there were many others involved in manipulating intelligence and leaking classified information to intimidate those who were telling the truth," Schumer said in a statement yesterday that made no mention of a pardon. "Yet those others remain unpunished, many staying in their current jobs — that is the real tragedy of this."

Though unnamed by Schumer, Cheney is the principal figure whose involvement in the internal pushback against Wilson was revealed by the seven-weeks-long trial. Cheney offered no public comment yesterday, and White House spokeswoman Dana Perino said the administration policy to withhold comment on ongoing investigations would continue in light of Libby's appeal.

Perino also told reporters that a pardon was "a hypothetical situation" that she had not addressed with the president, declining to rule it out.

When asked about a possible Libby pardon, most Republicans described the current speculation as premature. Sens. Arlen Specter (Pa.), Jeff Sessions (Ala.) and Sam Brownback (Kan.) were among those expressing such a sentiment.

Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) had no comment on the meaning or impact of the verdict.

Yet McCain questioned Reid and other Democrats seeking assurances of no amnesty for Libby: "Did any Republicans call on [former President] Clinton not to pardon the aptly named Mr. Rich?"

McCain referred to Marc Rich, a financier who fled to Switzerland in 1983 to escape U.S. imprisonment. Clinton pardoned Rich just before leaving office in 2001.

Sen. Barack Obama (D-Ill.), who shares the brighter spotlight of a presidential run with McCain, released his own statement on the verdict. "Leaks and innuendo in pursuit of a flawed policy lead to shameful episodes such as this. It should never happen again," Obama said.

DOJ_NMG_0141476

Sen. Chris Dodd (D-Conn.), another White House hopeful, called the verdict “appalling” in a statement.

Senate Republican Conference Chairman Jon Kyl (R-Ariz.) declined to offer a reaction to the verdict, noting that he considers Libby a friend. Kyl said Democratic demands for Bush to rule out a pardon were attempts to score political points off of Libby’s predicament.

“It speaks for itself,” Kyl said. “There’s a great Latin phrase: res ipsa loquitur.”

Pardoning Libby would be “a Nixonian-caliber mistake” by Bush, said Brent Budowsky, a former aide to the late Sen. Lloyd Bentsen (D-Texas), who was an original author of the law that prohibits disclosure of classified agents’ identities.

As the administration begins to assert a case for military action against Iran, Budowsky said, excusing the only official prosecuted in the Plame affair further would compromise the credibility of White House intelligence assertions. Of the political liability for Republicans, he added: “You’ve got 21 Republican senators up for reelection. Would any of them want to defend a pardon?”

Guess Libby's Pardon Date, Win A T-Shirt (WP)

By Al Kamen

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

The verdict is in! Now it's time for the In the Loop Pardon Scooter Contest! Yes, simply pick the date that President Bush will pardon Vice President Cheney's former chief of staff, I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby, who, according to federal sentencing guidelines, is looking at 18 months to three years in the slammer.

U.S. District Judge Reggie B. Walton has set June 5 for sentencing. He has discretion to order Libby immediately to prison or let him stay out until his appeals are exhausted. So, assuming that Bush -- who could pardon immediately if he wanted -- won't allow Libby to spend time behind bars, he might need to act then.

If not, the next likely pardon time would be when the U.S. Appeals Court for the D.C. Circuit announces its decision on Libby's appeal. That can take many months. The court recently has been averaging about 15 months from appeal to decision. By that schedule, it could rule on Libby's appeal in September 2008, right before the election.

If Libby loses the appeal, Walton may decide then to order him to prison. This would make it decision time again for Bush. It's not a squeeze the White House wants to be in.

The best hope for the White House would be if Libby stays out pending appeal and the appeals court doesn't rule until after the election. Then a pardon might come along with the Thanksgiving turkey or around Christmas.

Send your entries -- one date only: month, day and year -- to: intheloop@washpost.com. Ten people closest to the pardon date will receive a coveted In the Loop T-shirt. You must include your name and telephone numbers to be eligible. Deadline is March 14, assuming Bush doesn't act before then.Affirmative Action? Moi?

Maybe it's not Tom Cruise jumping the couch, but Justice Clarence Thomas, in a most unusual interview in the current Business Week, angrily denounces "the media" and the idea that he benefited from what some might call "affirmative action."

The magazine's senior writer, Diane Brady, had barely said "hello" in the justice's chambers in January when Thomas launched into a tirade. "One of the reasons I don't do media interviews is, in the past, the media often has its own script. . . . The media, unfortunately, have been universally untrustworthy" -- no exceptions, it seems -- "because they have their own notions of what I should think or I should do."

Brady, after much effort, got the rare interview because she was writing an article about Thomas's beloved college mentor, the Rev. John E. Brooks, the former president of Holy Cross College, who set out in 1968 to recruit African Americans to the Massachusetts school. Brooks had asked Thomas to see her.

Thomas, despite his view of reporters, talked on and on, unburdening at length about his life, his days at Holy Cross and at Yale Law School and his current job. (See a redacted transcript at http://www.businessweek.com/print/magazine/content/07_11/b4025080.htm?chan=g1)

Brooks, then a dean at the college, went to inner-city Catholic schools, offering scholarships and even driving some kids from Philadelphia to the Worcester campus to have a look. He saw the number of blacks go up from about two per class of 650 a couple years earlier, to 28 entering in 1968.

The extraordinary group, in addition to Thomas, included Ted Wells, I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby's attorney who was named 2006 Lawyer of the Year by the National Law Journal; former New York City deputy mayor and investment banker Stanley E. Grayson; and Eddie J. Jenkins, a former pro football player and now chair of the Massachusetts Alcoholic Beverages Control Commission.

So this recruitment drive, which in no way amounted to affirmative action but miraculously boosted black enrollment, maybe helped Thomas? Brady asked.

DOJ_NMG_0141477

"Oh, no," he said. "I was going to go home to Savannah," after he left a Missouri seminary, "when a nun suggested Holy Cross. That's how I wound up there. Your industry has suggested that we were all recruited. That's a lie. Really, it's a lie. I don't mean a mistake. It's a lie," Thomas said.

Had to be intentional. After all, no reporter would have thought everyone had been recruited when only 27 of 28 were. "I was never recruited," Thomas said. "The others were recruited." Thomas said he got there by "total serendipity. I just showed up. But somebody had to recognize it was a good place to be, and it was a Franciscan nun."

Others in Thomas's group don't seem as bothered by the notion that Holy Cross finally reached out to minority students. Noting his unimpressive SAT scores and unexciting high school grades, Edward P. Jones told BusinessWeek: "Five years earlier, Holy Cross would not have chosen me." Jones, of course, is the Washington native and Pulitzer Prize-winning author of the bestseller: "The Known World."

Thomas said he is working on his memoirs -- he got a $1.5 million advance from HarperCollins a while back, but it doesn't appear he'll be finishing any time soon.

Loop Fans will be able to read "Supreme Discomfort: The Divided Soul of Clarence Thomas," by our colleagues Kevin Merida and Michael A. Fletcher, coming out April 24. Former Baltimore mayor and now Howard University law school Dean Kurt Schmoke says the book "is not a collection of preconceived notions in search of supporting facts."

Thomas, who now sits atop the legal world, also complained of "the exhaustion."

What sort of exhaustion? Brady asked.

"Everything," Thomas said. "Mental. Physical. Spiritual. Just constant change. You just want to slow down. You see people take a walk and you want to, too."

Imagine how he'd feel if he'd been on the court in the 1980s, when they had twice as many opinions to write and arguments to hear as they do now. Then there are those exhausting summers off.Moving On . . .

James Glassman, television pundit, American Enterprise Institute scholar, former editor of Roll Call, former Washington Post columnist and author of books including our favorite -- "Dow 36,000: The New Strategy for Profiting From the Coming Rise in the Stock Market" -- is said to be getting the job of chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors, a part-time -- but time-consuming -- gig overseeing the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, Radio Free Asia, the Middle East Broadcasting Networks and the Cuba broadcasting operation.Exiting the FEC?

Word spread yesterday that Federal Election Commission member Michael Toner will announce his departure today to start an election law practice in town. Toner came to the FEC in 2002 after a stint as chief counsel to the Republican National Committee and as general counsel to the Bush 2000 campaign.

Jurors Wonder Why Others Weren't Also On Trial (USAT)

By Richard Willing

USA Today, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON — A question occupied the jurors in the trial of Lewis "Scooter" Libby as they sat through 14 days of testimony and deliberated for 10 more days: Why is Libby the only person on trial?

"There was a tremendous amount of sympathy for Mr. Libby on the jury. It was said a number of times: 'What are we doing with this guy here? Where's (White House adviser Karl) Rove? Where are these other guys?' " juror Denis Collins said Tuesday.

"I'm not saying we didn't think Mr. Libby was guilty of the things we found him guilty of. It seemed like he was, as (Libby attorney Theodore) Wells put it, he was the fall guy."

In the end, however, only Libby was charged by special prosecutor Patrick Fitzgerald after an investigation to find out who leaked the identity of a covert CIA officer to reporters in the spring and summer of 2003.

Libby's conviction on charges of "perjury and obstruction of justice is like convicting (mobster) Al Capone of tax evasion," said former State Department official Joseph Wilson. "It doesn't mean no other crimes occurred."

By the time jurors started deliberating Feb. 21, they and others knew that Libby was far from alone in discussing the undercover CIA role of Wilson's wife, Valerie Plame.

There was former White House spokesman Ari Fleischer, who told reporters that Plame worked for the agency. So did Rove, President Bush's top political adviser. And so did Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage.

All were part of Bush administration efforts to defend the White House against Wilson's criticisms. Starting in May 2003 and culminating two months later, Wilson claimed the administration trumped up reports that Iraq had sought uranium from the African nation of Niger.

Wilson was sent by the CIA to Niger in February 2002 to investigate the reports. He concluded that they were likely baseless.

DOJ_NMG_0141478

Cheney, jurors were told throughout the trial, was angered by Wilson's claims that Cheney himself had dispatched Wilson and then disregarded his report. Wilson claimed Libby and others disclosed his wife's CIA job as a way of discrediting Wilson.

Deliberately divulging the identity of an undercover CIA officer can be a federal crime. The Justice Department started investigating in fall 2003. Fitzgerald was appointed as a special prosecutor that December because Libby and other top officials were targets.

After 22 months of investigating, Fitzgerald couldn't determine whether anyone had leaked Plame's identity on purpose. What he did find, however, he couldn't ignore, he said Tuesday. He had evidence that Libby, the vice president's top aide and troubleshooter, had lied to investigators. Fitzgerald said he had to bring that case.

Collins said jurors knew of the case's larger stakes, but they focused only on the specific charges.

"This wasn't about the war," said Collins, a former Washington Post reporter. "I don't think anybody really knew what (Libby) did in this administration. He was sort of under everybody's radar."

Instead, Collins said, the jurors had to determine the case's specifics. Did Libby intentionally mislead FBI investigators and a grand jury?

They believed he did.

They didn't believe Libby's claim of faulty memory. In the jury lounge on the federal courthouse's sixth floor, they posted photos of witnesses and 34 pages of summarized testimony that led them to conclude that Libby discussed Plame's identity often during the time he said he had forgotten it, Collins said.

Because so many of the jurors believed Libby was the fall guy, Collins said, he would have "no problem" if Bush decided to pardon Libby.

Bush's Democratic opponents didn't see it that way Tuesday. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., said the president "must pledge not to pardon Libby for his criminal conduct."

In a statement released within minutes of the verdict, Reid said, "It's about time someone in the Bush administration has been held accountable for the campaign to manipulate intelligence and discredit war critics." The trial "revealed deeper truths about Vice President Cheney's role in this sordid affair."

Libby 'Pilloried' For Leak, Panel Members Believed (WP)

By Amy Goldstein And Elizabeth Williamson

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

The jurors who huddled around two pushed-together conference tables for 10 days, meticulously filling 34 pages of facts from the trial on a large flip chart, believed that Vice President Cheney's former chief of staff had been "pilloried" for a CIA leak that other top White House aides had committed along with him, according to one member of the panel.

Still, the juror said yesterday, the jury concluded that I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby had lied to FBI agents and a federal grand jury that investigated the leak. Sifting through mounds of evidence convinced the panel that Libby's memory of conversations with colleagues and journalists was not as faulty as the defense contended.

"We're not saying that we didn't think Mr. Libby was guilty of the things we found him guilty of," said the juror, Denis Collins. "But it seemed like he was . . . the fall guy."

Collins, an author and ex-Washington Post reporter, was the only one of the seven women and four men on the jury to provide an inside glimpse into the method and thought process that the panel used to find Cheney's former top aide guilty of four felony counts.

Libby's conviction on two counts of perjury, one count of making false statements and one count of obstructing justice stemmed from what he told investigators about his role in disclosing the identity of undercover CIA officer Valerie Plame. Her husband, Joseph C. Wilson IV, a retired ambassador, was sent by the CIA to Africa to assess reports that Iraq had sought to buy nuclear material there.

In the spring and early summer of 2003, Wilson infuriated Cheney and other White House officials by accusing President Bush of twisting his findings to justify the Iraq war. The prosecution contended Libby told reporters that Plame worked at the agency to insinuate that her husband was chosen for the CIA mission because of nepotism.

Collins's detailed description of the jury's deliberations, in public comments and interviews yesterday, suggests that Libby's attorneys made headway with one of the themes they emphasized throughout the case: that the defendant, as lead defense attorney Theodore V. Wells Jr. described it, was made a scapegoat by the White House to protect other presidential aides who were complicit in disclosing Plame's identity to reporters.

During the jury's days of methodical deliberations, "it was said a number of times, 'What are we doing with this guy here?' " Collins told reporters on the steps outside the federal courthouse. "Where's Rove, where's -- you know, where are these other

DOJ_NMG_0141479

guys?" Collins said, referring to Karl Rove, Bush's top political adviser, and Richard L. Armitage, a former deputy chief of staff who testimony showed had been the first person to leak Plame's name.

Moreover, Collins said, jurors believed that Libby had been carrying out a directive by his immediate boss, Cheney, to "go out and talk to reporters" to tarnish Wilson's reputation. But Collins said jurors stopped short of discussing whether the vice president specifically urged Libby to tell journalists about Plame's CIA job.

Nevertheless, the jury, by Collins's telling, was more strongly persuaded by the prosecution's central contention: It was implausible that Libby could have forgotten his role in finding out and telling reporters about Plame when he met with federal investigators. In particular, Collins said, jurors were struck by the juxtaposition of testimony from former White House press secretary Ari Fleischer and eight hours of audiotapes they heard of Libby's grand jury testimony.

A prosecution witness, Fleischer testified that Libby had told him "hush hush" about Plame over lunch on July 8, 2003 -- a Tuesday. In his grand jury testimony from March 2004, Libby said that Tim Russert, Washington bureau chief of NBC News, told him about Plame during a conversation two or three days later, and that Libby had the impression he was learning about her for the first time. "It was just very hard not to believe how he could remember it on a Tuesday and then forget it on a Thursday," Collins said.

He said jurors thought it was especially implausible that Libby forgot when and how he learned about Plame, given that he repeated that information to other people. "If I tell it to someone else, it's even more unlikely that I would forget it," Collins said.

The 11 jurors who convicted Libby on all but one count were, in several respects, atypical of the District's population. In a city that is heavily Democratic and where attention to politics runs high, the jurors were a largely apolitical group. Under careful questioning during jury selection, Libby's attorneys weeded out members of the large initial jury panel who said they held strong negative views of the Bush administration -- and even ones who said they followed news and politics closely.

In a city that is majority African American, all but two members of the jury -- both women -- were white. In addition, the jury was highly educated, including three members with PhDs.

The jury began its deliberations Feb. 21 with 12 members. But a woman in her 70s who holds a doctorate in art history was dismissed by U.S. District Judge Reggie B. Walton last week after telling fellow jurors that she had been exposed to outside information about Libby -- a violation of the judge's instructions.

The jury chose as its forewoman an accountant who works at the law firm Hogan & Hartson.

According to Collins, the tenor of deliberations was cool. Sitting in armchairs around the conference tables, with an adjacent office for phone calls to home and work, he said: "We were in a cocoon." To begin, the jury members used the large Post-it pages they had procured from the court to detail each witness's testimony, motivation to tell the truth, believability and state of mind.

"We took about a week just to get all these little building blocks there . . . We reached no decision quickly."

"In the end," Collins said, "what we came up with was that Mr. Libby either was told by or told to people about Mrs. Wilson at least nine times."

After reaching the verdict on the last charge at 11:15 yesterday morning, Collins said the jurors displayed little emotion. But after they filed out of the courtroom slightly more than an hour later, their verdict rendered, several wept as they walked through a corridor toward Walton's chambers for a final meeting with the judge.

Collins said he interpreted the tears as the release of pent-up tension from the long, celebrated trial. "It was not," he said, because jurors were thinking, " 'Oh, we're sorry to see Libby convicted.' "

Members Of A Sympathetic Jury Describe An Emotional But Inevitable Conclusion (NYT)

By Eric Lipton

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON, March 6 — One juror, Rosemary Russo, a government lawyer, described it as an “emotional” decision that left some jurors in tears.

“I don’t think it was an easy decision for any of us,” Ms. Russo said. “I think anyone who was in the room when the decision was made saw that the jury was teared up.”

But another juror, Denis Collins, a former Washington Post reporter, said that after 10 days of meticulous examination of the evidence, the verdict was inevitable.

“There was no big hammer that came down,” Mr. Collins said. “It was just the arithmetic of it became obvious.”

As the days passed, the brown-paneled walls of the deliberation room where I. Lewis Libby Jr.’s fate would be decided filled up with photographs of the witnesses and 34 large Post-it notes summarizing every critical piece of their testimony.

Those pieces of evidence became the building blocks leading to the jury’s conclusion: that Mr. Libby was guilty of perjury and obstruction of justice.

DOJ_NMG_0141480

The two jurors who talked after the verdict described how they came almost reluctantly to the decision, with Mr. Collins saying Mr. Libby had been "the fall guy" for the administration.

But they said it was just too much of a leap for them to think that Mr. Libby's contradictory accounts were the result of a bad memory.

"There was no wiggle room about it, unless you think all these people who work for the administration were lying," said Mr. Collins, who emerged as a de facto spokesman for the 11-member jury and later discussed the verdict in a phone interview.

From early on, he said, he considered Mr. Libby a decent person, worthy of their sympathy. And he wondered why other senior Bush administration officials were not facing trial in the disclosure of a C.I.A. operative's identity.

"Where is Rove? Where are these other guys?" Mr. Collins said, referring to President Bush's senior adviser, Karl Rove. "I wish we weren't judging Libby."

The jury that convicted Mr. Libby was a well-educated group, including an investment banker with a doctorate in economics from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the financial manager of a Washington law firm, and their detailed-oriented, collaborative journey through the evidence reflected that.

Inside the deliberation room, two long tables were pushed together and the blinds closed to block the sun, with the jurors only occasionally peeking outside to dream about running out and picking up a hot dog from a cart in the nearby plaza.

The jury agreed not to try to take initial votes of their disposition toward convicting Mr. Libby. Instead, they undertook a laborious review of all the testimony, even grading the witnesses and marking down reasons whether or not to believe what each one said.

"Motivation to tell the truth? Motivation to lie?" Mr. Collins said, recalling the list of questions they went through for each witness. "Believability? State of mind?"

Ari Fleischer, the former press secretary for President Bush, was deemed "credible," Mr. Collins said, given how "brutally honest" he was, since he testified that reporters would not listen to him when he tried to pitch an article that might support the administration's views.

"Why would he make himself look bad on purpose?" Mr. Collins said of Mr. Fleischer's testimony.

One particularly important focus, Mr. Collins said, was testimony about a conversation Mr. Libby had with Tim Russert, the Washington bureau chief of NBC News. Mr. Libby had said Mr. Russert told him about Valerie Wilson's job with the Central Intelligence Agency around July 10 or July 11, 2003.

Although Mr. Libby acknowledged that he had heard earlier about Ms. Wilson from his boss, Vice President Dick Cheney, he said he had forgotten about it until the July exchange with Mr. Russert, when "it was like hearing it for the first time."

The jury considered carefully the testimony that Mr. Libby's memory was faulty, Mr. Collins said, especially the suggestion from his aide, John Hannah, that he often could not recall, in a single day, who had told him what.

But the nine separate conversations involving eight people who claimed that Mr. Libby had talked about or participated in an exchange about Ms. Wilson with them — at least some before the conversation with Mr. Russert — were just too convincing, Mr. Collins said.

"One of the jurors said, 'If I am told something once, I am likely to forget it,' " Mr. Collins recalled. " 'But if I am told it many times, it is much less likely I will forget it. And if I tell it to someone else, that is even more unlikely.' "

The deliberations progressed with almost no political undertones, Mr. Collins said. In fact, he said, he did not know the party affiliation of any of the other jurors until after they reached their verdict, when three jurors volunteered that they were registered as independents.

There also was no discussion about the subtext of the trial — the decision to go to war against Iraq.

"This was not a question about who can we punish for going to Iraq," said Mr. Collins, 57, a registered Democrat. "We just never allowed ourselves to go there, and I am not going to go there now."

Even though Mr. Libby never testified at the trial, the jury had access to eight hours of his grand jury testimony, which earned him a fair amount of sympathy as they listened to him politely answer questions.

"We are not saying that we did not think that Mr. Libby was not guilty of these things," Mr. Collins said. But he then added, "He was the fall guy. He made bad judgments."

The two main lawyers in the case, Patrick J. Fitzgerald, the prosecutor, and Theodore V. Wells Jr., for the defense, had radically different styles, but both were effective in their own ways, Mr. Collins said.

"They were each just working with what they were given," he said, "and the way it came out we just thought that Fitzgerald was given a lot more, he had a lot more to work with."

Prosecution By Logic Defeats A Defense In Shades Of Gray (NYT)

By Scott Shane

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON, March 6 — The trial of I. Lewis Libby Jr. played out as a left-brain, right-brain contest, posing the prosecution's just-the-facts appeal to logic against the defense's far more emotional argument about human frailty.

In the end, after a painstaking, 10-day dissection of the evidence, the 11 jurors found the case presented by the prosecutor Patrick J. Fitzgerald inescapable: The well-documented misstatements of Mr. Libby were not those of an innocently forgetful man but of a calculating serial perjurer.

"It got to the point," said Denis Collins, one of the jurors, where "opinion had very little to do with it. You just came to this conclusion that, 'Wow, O.K., here it is right before us.' "

The charges against Mr. Libby, Vice President Dick Cheney's former top aide and alter ego, have unfolded over the last two years as an overwrought Washington opera, rich with White House intrigue, insider journalism and the polarized politics of the Iraq war. But Mr. Fitzgerald successfully persuaded the jury to sweep all that aside and focus narrowly on what he repeatedly called Mr. Libby's lies.

Legal experts said the prosecution team's methodical, unemotional approach had proved especially effective with the unusually well-educated jury.

"This verdict is a remarkable endorsement of the no-nonsense case the independent counsel presented," said Lanny A. Breuer, a veteran Washington trial lawyer who represented President Bill Clinton during impeachment proceedings.

A jury that deliberates for more than a week often finds itself in a "quagmire," Mr. Breuer said. But that did not happen this time, as the prosecution's repeated emphasis on the nine conversations that Mr. Libby claimed not to recall proved an effective guide for the jurors.

"The government's case was very simple, very matter-of-fact," said E. Lawrence Barcella Jr., a Washington defense lawyer and former prosecutor. "The government argued, 'How could anyone forget all this?' They presented witness after witness, boom, boom, boom, boom."

If the trial never quite rivaled such Washington legal landmarks as the Watergate and Iran-contra cases, it was because in the end neither Mr. Libby nor Mr. Cheney took the stand.

The decision by the defense team, led by Theodore V. Wells Jr., not to call Mr. Libby as a witness may be debated in legal circles for years. The jury heard the defendant's own explanation for his memory problems only on the tape of his 2004 grand jury testimony, where he stressed his huge workload and declared, "I can't possibly recall all the stuff that I think is important, let alone other stuff that I don't think is as important."

But Stanley M. Brand, a defense lawyer in Washington for 25 years, said he would not second-guess the decision not to have Mr. Libby testify. "I think his lawyers believed that whatever thin reed of reasonable doubt they'd created could be dashed on cross-examination if he took the stand," Mr. Brand said.

The prosecution and the defense could hardly have offered a sharper contrast in style. For Mr. Fitzgerald, the evidence was a yes-or-no affair: Mr. Libby lied under oath about his knowledge of Valerie Wilson, an undercover C.I.A. officer whose husband, Joseph C. Wilson IV, had accused the Bush administration of distorting prewar intelligence. Mr. Libby lied, Mr. Fitzgerald said, to avoid any hint that he had broken the law by revealing her secret employment as a spy to reporters while rebutting Mr. Wilson's criticism.

"He had a motive to lie, and the motive to lie matched up exactly with the lie," Mr. Fitzgerald told the jury. "That's where your common sense kicks in."

Mr. Fitzgerald kept his questioning of each witness brief and focused, zeroing in on one or two main points that he wished to highlight for the jury. His Joe Friday manner itself carried a message — that the evidence of Mr. Libby's guilt was strong enough not to need embellishment or protracted explanation.

"Fitzgerald brought a very stripped-down case," said Mr. Brand, the defense lawyer. "He stuck very tightly to his script."

Reviewing the testimony of Tim Russert, the host of "Meet the Press" on NBC and the most important prosecution witness, Mr. Fitzgerald told the jury, "Don't let arguments, don't let distractions take away from your judgment of the witness you saw."

In his summation, Mr. Fitzgerald's associate Peter Zeidenberg repeatedly boiled the case down to mathematics: "Let's add it up. Nine conversations about Wilson's wife with eight different people. Mr. Libby claims to remember none of them."

In place of the black-and-white clarity of the prosecution's presentation, Mr. Wells painted in lavish shades of gray. He stressed nuance and uncertainty, pursuing seeming tangents with inexhaustible curiosity until Judge Reggie B. Walton decided to cut him off.

The defense surprised many, including the judge, by failing to put Mr. Libby on the stand to attest to his own memory lapses. But Mr. Wells, together with his colleague William H. Jeffress Jr., had some success in turning the prosecution's witnesses to their own use, as even a senior C.I.A. officer and a veteran F.B.I. agent admitted to striking lapses of memory.

DOJ_NMG_0141482

The defense team tried to bolster the faulty-memory issue with its most important witness, John Hannah, Mr. Libby's former deputy. Describing at length the crucial issues of war and terrorism that consumed Mr. Libby's schedule, Mr. Hannah said his boss had an "awful" memory for who told him what — though Mr. Hannah later conceded that Mr. Libby had an excellent recall for ideas.

Mr. Wells, in his closing argument, made a theatrical appeal to emotion. Mr. Libby "is a good person," Mr. Wells said with a choking sob. "He has been under my protection for the last month. I give him to you."

Courtroom observers questioned whether Mr. Wells might have overshot the mark in that plea to a jury that even during the trial appeared to be quite analytical. Through long and sometimes tedious testimony, the jurors proved attentive, taking notes and passing insightful questions to the judge.

As much as the spectators, the jury seemed to appreciate the extraordinary window the trial opened on the hidden world where high-level officials interact with reporters, bringing scrutiny that neither group welcomed.

"From the standpoint of how Washington works and the relations between journalists and sources," said Mr. Barcella, who has practiced law in Washington for more than 30 years, "it's been incredibly revealing and incredibly uncomfortable for a lot of people."

Trial's Lesson: Just Take The Fifth (WSJ)

By Jess Bravin And Ashby Jones

The Wall Street Journal, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON -- With yesterday's conviction, Lewis "Scooter" Libby joins a line of individuals stretching from Alger Hiss to Martha Stewart whose mistake wasn't committing an underlying crime, but lying to investigators.

In pursuing such well-known figures, prosecutors hope to send a message to the meek and mighty alike: Don't lie.

But some lawyers predict Mr. Libby's conviction may send another message: Say nothing at all, invoke the Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination. Ari Fleischer, for instance, the former White House press secretary, took the Fifth and then testified for the prosecution in the Libby case in exchange for immunity.

"Unless your client is in a situation where not testifying will cause them to lose their livelihood, and unless you're certain of what the facts are," there's no reason people under suspicion should talk with authorities, says Marvin Pickholz, a former Securities and Exchange Commission enforcement chief, now at Akerman Senterfitt in New York. "Your best hope is to say nothing," he says.

Prosecutors see high-profile perjury convictions as a significant deterrent, says Alejandro Mayorkas, the former U.S. attorney in Los Angeles. "When you prosecute high-profile individuals like Scooter Libby for false statements, that resonates in the community of potential future witnesses in the sophisticated white-collar arena," making them more likely to heed an attorney's advice to be entirely truthful, says Mr. Mayorkas, now with O'Melveny & Myers. "A lawyer has to be extremely careful to ensure the accuracy of his client's statements before" bringing him to the government or grand jury, he adds.

Still, many under investigation consider it unpalatable to admit wrongdoing or to invite suspicion by pleading the Fifth -- and end up testifying.

David Seide, a former assistant U.S. attorney who has both prosecuted and defended people accused of perjury, says most statements that trip the perjury trap aren't made with calculation, but on the fly. Witnesses who lie often fail to consider potential long-term consequences of trying to put investigators off the scent. Witnesses aren't thinking about how their words will sound two years later, says Mr. Seide, now with WilmerHale in Washington. "You are looking at what you do in real time. What kind of statement do you make? Are you going to confess or not?"

Mr. Seide represented former Bronx, N.Y., borough President Stanley Simon, who was summoned before a grand jury in a 1980s corruption scandal surrounding defense contractor Wedtech Corp. Faced with the choice of testifying or "taking five" -- as attorneys call invoking the Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination -- and seeing that fact become public, Mr. Simon decided to testify. That led to a perjury conviction and a five-year sentence.

Prosecutors have favored perjury charges for philosophical and practical reasons. Many prosecutors find noncooperation or, even worse, outright deception, deeply offensive.

As special prosecutor Patrick Fitzgerald, who is also U.S. attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, said yesterday: "Any prosecutor would tell you -- in my days in New York, in my current days in Chicago -- that we cannot tolerate perjury. ... If people don't come forward and tell the truth, we have no hope of making the judicial system work."

Prosecutors tend to use the threat of a perjury charge to persuade a witness to cooperate with the government against a bigger target. For that reason, the prosecution of a well-known figure such as Mr. Libby stands out; few bigger targets, other than the vice president or president, remain.

DOJ_NMG_0141483

Perjury charges are also attractive to prosecutors because it can be easier to nail a suspect for lying than for an underlying crime, as seen in the case of Alger Hiss. An influential aide in President Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration, Mr. Hiss advised FDR at the 1945 Yalta Conference and presided over the San Francisco Conference that created the United Nations.

In 1948, journalist and former Communist Party member Whittaker Chambers accused Mr. Hiss of belonging to a secret Communist "apparatus" functioning within the U.S. government. Mr. Hiss never was charged with espionage (for which the statute of limitations had passed) or treason, but with perjury after testifying that he hadn't spoken with Mr. Chambers in more than a decade or given him documents. A hung jury failed to convict Mr. Hiss. On retrial, he was found guilty and spent more than three years in prison.

More recently, authorities never developed enough evidence to charge Martha Stewart, founder of Martha Stewart Living Omnimedia Inc., with insider trading after she ordered a questionably timed sale of ImClone Systems Inc. stock. She was convicted instead in 2004 for lying to investigators about the sale's circumstances, bringing her five months in prison.

Such a relatively light penalty shows that while it may be easier to convict a defendant for lying to authorities than for the underlying allegations themselves, perjury isn't taken as seriously as the substantive crime.

And for politically prominent perjurers, redemption by their patrons is always a possibility. After losing his bid for re-election in 1992, President George H.W. Bush pardoned six former Reagan-Bush administration officials facing obstruction or related charges in the Iran-Contra scandal, including Elliott Abrams, who pleaded guilty to withholding information from Congress.

The current President Bush hired Mr. Abrams to serve as deputy national security adviser.

Legal Observers Puzzled By 'Scooter' Libby's Version Of Events (LAT)

By David G. Savage

The Los Angeles Times, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON — Most legal experts were not surprised Tuesday when jurors convicted I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby on four of five counts of lying to federal investigators.

What puzzled some of the experts were the statements Libby made to investigators about when and how he learned that Valerie Plame was a CIA agent. Libby said NBC reporter Tim Russert told him during a July 2003 phone conversation. At trial, Libby's claim was contradicted by nine witnesses, including government officials, who said he had talked to them about Plame weeks earlier.

"I do not understand why he did that, or what advice of counsel he had. It is a real question in this case. And it defies explanation," said Washington attorney Robert S. Bennett.

From the outset, as legal experts saw it, the case against Libby was simple and straightforward — and hard to defend against.

The problem with Libby's statements to investigators was that he had held meetings and telephone conversations with other reporters, as well as with various government officials, to talk about Plame and her husband, former envoy and Iraq war critic Joseph C. Wilson IV, during the previous month. Two CIA officials, a former State Department official, two former White House spokespersons and several journalists who testified reluctantly about their confidential conversations with Libby told the jury they heard Libby talking about Plame well before he spoke to Russert.

Libby's defense argued that he had simply forgotten about those earlier conversations and had not meant to lie to the FBI.

But Wilson and Plame were not minor figures to White House insiders, nor were they easy to forget. Vice President Dick Cheney and others were furious at Wilson for saying President Bush had falsely claimed in his State of the Union message that Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein had tried to buy uranium in Niger. Wilson based his accusation — which undercut Bush's claim that Iraq was seeking nuclear weapons — on a fact-finding trip he had made to Africa, a trip sponsored by the CIA and arranged in part by his wife.

Moreover, with their client facing charges of deliberately lying to investigators who were probing the leaking of Plame's identity, Libby's lawyers claimed that Cheney's former chief of staff had a faulty memory. At the same time, they said he remembered well that it was Russert who first told him that Wilson's wife worked for the CIA.

Jurors were not persuaded.

"If someone knowingly tells a lie under oath, it is every prosecutor's duty to bring charges," Special Prosecutor Patrick J. Fitzgerald said after the verdict. "We knew Mr. Libby had told a story, and we could not walk away from that."

Why did Libby tell an implausible story to FBI agents and later to the grand jury? veteran defense lawyers wondered Tuesday.

He may have felt trapped. In July 2003, when the issue of the Plame leak boiled up, Bush said firmly that he wanted to know whether anyone in the White House had leaked classified information. Plame's identity as an undercover agent was classified and secret, Fitzgerald said again Tuesday.

DOJ_NMG_0141484

That October, an FBI agent interviewed Libby. At that time, the investigation was an internal matter within the Bush administration. But under pressure from Congress, Atty. Gen. John Ashcroft stepped aside and had his deputy appoint a special prosecutor. He chose Fitzgerald, a U.S. attorney from Chicago with a reputation for doggedness.

By March 2004, when Libby was called before the grand jury, Fitzgerald had witnesses within the White House who could contradict the chief of staff's account.

Since the Watergate scandal of the 1970s, one of Washington's favored cliches has been that it's not the crime but the cover-up that gets officials into trouble.

"This is emblematic of these cases," said Stanley Brand, a longtime defense lawyer. "Smart people go before an investigator and they don't have their facts straight. Maybe he [Libby] believed he could get away with it because the reporters would not talk."

Prosecutor Fitzgerald surprised some in Washington by insisting that journalists who had spoken to Libby would have to talk to him and the grand jury.

Then-New York Times reporter Judith Miller went to jail to protect the confidentiality of her conversations with Libby, and she eventually relented and testified against him.

George Washington University law professor Stephen Saltzburg wondered whether the culture of Washington and the Bush White House might have led to Libby's downfall.

"This administration seems to have had a very difficult time being candid with the American people. Maybe if you get into the habit of saying what you wish things to be — like Iraq's weapons of mass destruction are a 'slam dunk,' or 'We're making good progress in Iraq' — you have a hard time speaking candidly. They may spin the press and the public. Maybe he tried to spin the FBI too," said Saltzburg, a prosecutor during the Iran-Contra probe of the 1980s.

Libby was himself a prominent lawyer, a graduate of Yale University and Columbia Law School. In the 1990s, he represented fugitive financier Marc Rich and helped win for him a pardon from President Clinton.

Now his hopes rest with a successful appeal in the federal courts in Washington or with a pardon from President Bush. There, he has some precedents on his side.

After the Iran-Contra scandal in the Reagan administration, two White House officials — National Security Advisor John Poindexter and his aide Oliver North — were found guilty on several criminal charges. But the U.S. appeals court here overturned their convictions.

And just before leaving office, President George H.W. Bush handed down pardons for several others, including President Reagan's Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger.

Juror Describes Deliberations That Led To Libby Conviction (LAW)

By Emma Schwartz, Legal Times

Legal Times, March 7, 2007

After nearly 10 days of deliberations, a federal jury Tuesday convicted I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby of four counts of obstruction of justice, perjury and making false statements.

The jury of 11 men and women found the former Bush administration official guilty of obstructing a federal investigation, lying to a grand jury about his July 2003 conversations with NBC's Tim Russert and former Time magazine reporter Matthew Cooper and lying to the FBI about his conversation with Russert. They acquitted him on one other charge of false statements in connection with what he told the FBI about his conversation with Cooper.

Sentencing is scheduled for June 5. While Libby, 56, faces 25 years in prison, it's more likely he will receive something close to what former White House official David Safavian received after being convicted on four counts of obstruction of justice and making false statements. Safavian received an 18-month sentence.

The Libby verdict was a blow to the Bush administration, which had tried to distance itself of wrongdoing from the start of the federal investigation. Indeed, a juror who spoke to the media after the verdict was delivered said the panel came to believe that Libby was a "fall guy" working at the behest of Vice President Dick Cheney. "The jurors said: 'What are we doing with Libby? Where's [Karl] Rove?'" said the juror, Denis Collins.

At 11:15 Tuesday morning, the jury sent Judge Reggie Walton a note informing him that it had come to a decision. Court was convened 45 minutes later.

In a packed courtroom, the foreperson, an accountant at Hogan & Hartson, took the microphone and, while seated, read the verdict. Most jurors were dressed for the occasion -- the retired math teacher on the jury was wearing a suit -- indicating that they were close to a consensus Monday evening. When the verdict was read, one juror wept. Libby, however, remained impassive. At one point, one of his lawyers, William Jeffress Jr., put his hands on Libby's shoulders.

DOJ_NMG_0141485

"We are very disappointed in the verdict of the jurors," Libby attorney Theodore Wells Jr. said in a press conference outside the federal courthouse in Washington. Wells said the defense team will file a motion for a new trial and, if that motion is denied, it would appeal. Wells and Libby took no questions and were swarmed by cameramen as they tried to re-enter the courthouse. "Let us by," Wells said. "We've been good to you."

The investigation stems from claims by former Ambassador Joseph Wilson, who charged in a 2003 op-ed in The New York Times that the Bush administration misled the country into war. He claimed to know that certain intelligence that Iraq sought uranium from Niger was false because he had been sent there to investigate by the CIA. Less than two weeks later, syndicated columnist Robert Novak published an article disclosing that Wilson's wife, Valerie Plame, worked at the CIA and had sent him on the mission. Libby was the only person charged as a result of Special Counsel Patrick Fitzgerald's 2 1/2-year investigation into whether classified information about Plame's CIA employment was illegally leaked to the media.

The four-plus weeks of testimony brought a parade of high-profile witnesses, including Cheney's chief of staff and his national security adviser, CIA officials, former White House press secretaries and Pulitzer Prize-winning journalists. The prosecution took about three weeks to make its case, which pitted Libby's grand jury testimony and FBI statements directly against those of three reporters -- Russert, Cooper and former New York Times reporter Judith Miller. The defense rested after barely three days of testimony without calling two promised witnesses: Libby and Cheney.

In a press conference after the verdict, Fitzgerald said that his investigation was essentially over, and that he didn't expect to seek further charges against anyone in the matter.

He emphasized that when he took over the investigation he had full knowledge that Libby's account conflicted with Russert's.

"We couldn't walk away from that," he said. He added that what Libby did was "harmful to the system, and that was something serious."

ONE JUROR'S ACCOUNT

Collins, 57, a former Washington Post reporter, was the sole juror to give an account of the deliberations. The other 10 jurors declined to speak to the media, but Collins said, after years as a journalist, "I just figured it would be kind of hypocritical for me to walk away."

By his account, jurors gathered each day on the 6th floor of the courthouse, in a room overlooking the D.C. Department of Motor Vehicles. The room had two long tables and a few cushioned seats. When they arrived the first Wednesday afternoon, everyone looked at each other without knowing what to do. "They don't give you a field manual on how to be a juror," he said.

But the jury was a resourceful one, full of methodical panelists who knew how to take charge and break down complicated material into digestible bits. And that is what they did for the first week, gathering large Post-it notes (2 1/2 by 2 feet) with quotes and information concerning the evidence presented. The jury had some meticulous note-takers, Collins said, including one who calculated how many objections had been sustained during Russert's testimony (25 out of 36). For the first week of deliberations, the jury made no decisions, took no straw polls, but systematically went through the evidence. They asked: Who told the truth? Who lied? Who do we believe?

The debate was not about the war. It was not about politics. Collins said he didn't even know the politics of most jurors during deliberations. (Although he said he learned this morning that at least three were registered independents.) There were "differences of opinion, but no fistfights," Collins said. (For instance, he said one person thought former White House press secretary Ari Fleischer was a "slick willy," while Collins didn't think Fleischer had any motive to lie.)

At times, of course, the jury grew restless and would occasionally glance outside at a small stand with hot dogs and half-smokes. "It was like we were in a cocoon. I would forget what day it was," he said.

But in the end, Collins said, it simply came down to the facts, which pointed to a single answer: guilty. "Opinion had very little to do with it," he said.

What stood out most to the jury was Libby's account that he was "surprised" when he first learned that Valerie Plame worked at the CIA. "The least convincing thing was that Libby was working so hard that he could forget everything," Collins said.

Looking at the Post-its they had amassed, the jury found that in a short period of time Libby had either been told about Plame's employment, read about it, or told someone else at least nine times. "It seemed very unlikely that he would not have remembered about Mrs. Wilson," he said.

There was, he said, just too much evidence. He singled out the testimony from Marc Grossman, former undersecretary of state, who noted that the information about Wilson's wife was an "interesting tidbit." And Collins said that Cheney's handwritten notes on Wilson's op-ed questioning whether Plame sent her husband on a "junket" stood out.

"It was just very hard not to believe that he could remember on Tuesday and forget on Thursday and then remember two days later," Collins said, echoing the rhetoric Fitzgerald used during trial.

DOJ_NMG_0141486

While the jury was inclined to believe that Libby had a bad memory, Collins said John Hannah, Libby's former national security adviser who testified for the defense, seemed to hurt Libby. Hannah testified that Libby had an "awful memory," but jurors found that didn't mesh with his comments that Libby had a strong memory for conceptual issues, Collins said.

But when it came to the count about Libby's statements to the FBI about Cooper, jurors were more skeptical. Their eventual decision to acquit on that charge stemmed from the lack of documentation on Cooper's part. Cooper had no notes to back up that Libby confirmed Plame's identity and there was a passage in Cooper's notes that the defense tried to suggest represented Libby's explanation of the conversation. While jurors weren't absolutely convinced about that passage, those questioned "weighed six ounces" and were enough to create "reasonable doubt," Collins said.

On the whole, though, jurors found the key reporters testifying for the prosecution to be credible, he said. Some even thought the defense attorney's badgering of Miller worked against Libby. "Some said I think she seems nice," Collins recounted.

Jurors put little weight in the parade of journalists that testified for the defense. And even though Libby didn't testify at trial, Collins said the jury felt very good about having eight hours of his grand jury testimony.

Despite their decision, Collins said, "We had tremendous sympathy" for Libby. One juror said he didn't want to be judging Libby. "This sucks," Collins quoted the juror as saying. "The belief of the jury was that he was tasked by the vice president to talk to reporters," he said.

Yet, Collins emphasized, "This wasn't about the war ... This wasn't a question of who can we punish for going into Iraq."

Cheney's Suspected Role In Security Breach Drove Fitzgerald (WP)

By R. Jeffrey Smith

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

In a small room on the third floor of the D.C. federal courthouse in late March 2004, Special Counsel Patrick J. Fitzgerald stood before I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby and asked him three separate times whether his boss, Vice President Cheney, had discussed telling reporters that Valerie Plame worked for the CIA.

The question was not insignificant for Fitzgerald, who saw his mission as revealing the full chain of events behind the security breach involving Plame's work as an undercover CIA officer. Fitzgerald was unconvinced by Libby's response that even though he "may have" had such a conversation with Cheney, it probably occurred after Plame's identity had been revealed in a newspaper column.

Fitzgerald would respond with great frustration in his summation at Libby's trial almost three years later, saying that Libby's lies had effectively prevented him from learning about all of Cheney's actions in the administration's campaign to undermine Plame's husband, Joseph C. Wilson IV, a critic of the U.S. invasion of Iraq.

More than he had previously, Fitzgerald made clear in those remarks that his search for the truth about Cheney was a key ambition in his probe and that his inability to get it was a key provocation for Libby's indictment. Although Cheney was the target, Fitzgerald's investigation could not reach him because of Libby's duplicity.

Fitzgerald's summation explained, in part, why he brought charges based on imperfect evidence against Libby, even though Libby was not a source for Robert D. Novak, the author of the July 14, 2003, newspaper column that outed Plame as a CIA employee.

The jury's verdict addresses Fitzgerald's first conclusion -- that Libby lied deliberately and did not misspeak from faulty memory. But the trial showed that the prosecutor finished his investigation with his mind made up that Libby's account was meant to hide his own involvement as well as to conceal the potential involvement of the vice president.

At the trial's close, Fitzgerald expressed his concern in unusually blunt terms. After Libby's lawyers complained that he was trying to put a "cloud" over Cheney without evidence to back it up, Fitzgerald told the jury on Feb. 20, "We'll talk straight."

There was, he said, "a cloud over what the vice president did" during the period before Novak's column was published, and it was created by testimony about Cheney directing Libby and others at the White House to disseminate information on Wilson and Wilson's criticisms.

"We didn't put that cloud there. That cloud remains because the defendant obstructed justice and lied about what happened," Fitzgerald added.

The notion that Libby was merely a courtroom stand-in for Cheney infuriated Libby's lawyers, who sought in their courtroom statement to defend both men. "Nobody in the office of the vice president is concerned about" Plame, Libby attorney William Jeffress Jr. said in his closing argument. "She never was part of the story they were trying to put out."

Fitzgerald disagreed. He twice used a baseball metaphor to describe what he believes went on in the vice president's office -- at his announcement of Libby's indictment on Oct. 28, 2005, and again during his trial summation. Suppose, Fitzgerald said, you were looking into whether a pitcher had purposely beaned a batter, and if so, why.

"As you sit back, you want to learn why was this information going out. Why were people taking this information about Valerie Wilson and giving it to reporters?" Fitzgerald asked at the 2005 news conference. "What we have when someone charges obstruction of justice is the umpire gets sand thrown in his eyes. He's trying to figure out what happened, and somebody blocked their view."

Randall D. Eliason, a former chief prosecutor of public corruption and fraud in the U.S. attorney's office in Washington, said Fitzgerald "would not have been doing his job" if he had not brought the charges. If "witnesses believe they can lie to the FBI and lie in the grand jury and there will be no consequences, then it becomes impossible to investigate any criminal activity, from terrorism to shoplifting."

Witnesses in the case never presented evidence of illegal actions by Cheney, nor did they ever pin direct responsibility for the leak on him. They presented what some lawyers considered an imperfect picture of Libby's duplicity in pretrial and trial testimony marked by bouts of forgetfulness and hazy recollections of events.

Former New York Times reporter Judith Miller, former CIA official Robert Grenier, NBC News Washington bureau chief Tim Russert and former White House press secretary Ari Fleischer each gave accounts of their interactions with Libby or other journalists that conflicted with their earlier statements or with the recollections of others besides Libby.

"Almost every witness would misspeak on direct [questioning] or left something out of grand jury testimony or got a date wrong," said Ty Cobb, a former assistant U.S. attorney who heads the white-collar criminal defense group at Hogan & Hartson. He expressed skepticism that the case against Libby should have been presented to a jury.

But Fitzgerald's decision to do so may have stemmed from his pique at his inability to get to the truth about Cheney, who appeared in testimony and in White House documents disclosed to the jury as the man behind the screen, pulling the switches and levers in what one of Fitzgerald's aides described as an orchestrated "political public relations" campaign to undermine Wilson.

Cheney, Fitzgerald suggested, had both motive and opportunity to run the show: He was deeply angered, even preoccupied, by Wilson's claim that Cheney deliberately exaggerated the threat posed by Iraq's nuclear research. He was the first to tell Libby about Plame's job, and he scrawled a disparaging note about Plame's alleged responsibility for a CIA-sponsored "junket" to Niger that her husband took.

And finally, Cheney was convinced that if "everything" about the Wilson trip was disclosed to reporters, Wilson's credibility would be in tatters.

Libby's grand jury testimony addressed each point. "I'm not sure I would use the word 'ticked off,' but [Cheney] was frustrated" by the public impact of Wilson's critique, a topic that Cheney raised in multiple conversations, Libby said. Cheney directed Libby to interrogate Grenier on the reasons for the Wilson trip; he repeatedly "made comments" about Wilson's wife and mused about her role in arranging a junket; he dictated a set of talking points for journalists that opened with what Fitzgerald portrayed as a proverbial leading question about "who authorized Joe Wilson's trip to Niger."

"The question of who sent Wilson is important," Fitzgerald said. "It is a number one question on the vice president's mind."

Fitzgerald's presentation also called attention to two occasions in which Libby said Cheney instructed him to deal directly with reporters and spelled out what to say -- his meeting on July 8, 2003, with Miller and his telephone conversation four days later with Time magazine correspondent Matt Cooper. In both, Libby mentioned Plame's employment at the CIA.

Fitzgerald's concerns were heightened by Libby's reply to a question about when he and Cheney first discussed Plame's CIA employment. "I think it was after the [July 6] Wilson column," which accused the White House of lying about the justification for the Iraq war, Libby told the grand jury.

But then he added: "I'm sorry, I don't mean the Wilson column, I'm sorry. I misspoke. I think, I think it was after the [July 14] Novak column," which disclosed Plame's name. He and Cheney had discussed other Wilson-related matters in the intervening period, Libby said, but not "that part about the wife."

Fitzgerald, in his summation, said he found this explanation incredible. He said Cheney referred to Plame in a note he inscribed on Wilson's column and noted that over the next two days, Libby raised the issue of her CIA employment with three others: Miller, Fleischer and Cheney aide David Addington. "If you think that's a coincidence, well, that makes no sense," Fitzgerald said.

He also called the jury's attention to the fact that Libby disclosed to Cheney his statement to the FBI that he learned about Plame's employment from Russert, which Russert later disputed. "The only person he told was the vice president. Think about that," Fitzgerald said.

Libby's false account of events, he added, was meant to serve as a "blocker . . . to cut off all those conversations with people, including the vice president." There is, Fitzgerald said, "a cloud over the White House as to what happened. Don't you think the FBI, the grand jury, the American people are entitled to a straight answer?"

DOJ_NMG_0141488

Fitzgerald said at a news conference yesterday that Libby, "by lying and obstructing justice, harmed the system. And that was something serious. And that's the point we made to the jury, and obviously the jury agreed."

Libby Conviction Clears Way For Plame, Wilson Civil Suit (WT)

By Shaun Waterman

The Washington Times, March 7, 2007

The perjury conviction yesterday of former White House official I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby Jr. clears the way for a civil suit against him by former CIA agent Valerie Plame and her husband.

Libby was convicted of lying to investigators probing the leak of Mrs. Plame's identity in the wake of her husband's criticism of White House handling of pre-Iraq war intelligence, although Libby neither committed nor was charged with committing the leak.

Mrs. Plame and her husband, Joseph C. Wilson IV, sued Libby; his boss, Vice President Dick Cheney; and senior presidential adviser Karl Rove in July, saying the officials had violated their constitutional rights as part of a plot to retaliate against Mr. Wilson and discredit his criticism.

According to the lawsuit, the three officials, along with others not named, "reached an agreement to discredit, punish and seek revenge against the plaintiffs that included, among other things, disclosing to members of the press plaintiff Valerie Plame Wilson's classified CIA employment."

The lawsuit has been on hold during the Libby prosecution, but legal scholars say the conviction clears the way for it to be heard.

"Certainly if Libby had been acquitted, it would have been very damaging to the civil case," said Jonathon Turley, professor of law at George Washington University Law School.

Some of the facts that emerged from the criminal trial are relevant to the civil case, attorneys said. Officials testified to the close involvement of Mr. Cheney in the White House effort to respond to Mr. Wilson's criticism and his enlistment of other officials, including fellow defendant Mr. Rove, in the effort.

Testimony in the case also confirmed that Libby spoke with several reporters about Mrs. Plame's CIA employment.

On the other hand, it also became clear that contrary to what the lawsuit charges, neither Libby nor anyone else in the White House had been the source of the original leak to columnist Robert Novak, which came from State Department official Richard L. Armitage.

Melanie Sloan, Mrs. Plame's attorney and executive director of the nonprofit Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington, said the civil case would "provide the American public with its only opportunity to hear directly from Cheney, Libby, Rove and Armitage about what really took place behind the scenes after Joe Wilson exposed the truth about the administration's justification for the Iraq war."

The three defendants have argued that, as government officials, they are immune from being sued. It is the same grounds on which President Clinton sought unsuccessfully to quash Paula Jones' lawsuit.

Mr. Turley said Mr. Cheney and the others have a much better case than Mr. Clinton did. "Clinton's argument verged on the frivolous," he said, because the president was "clearly using his official immunity in a personal matter."

Mr. Cheney, Mr. Rove and Libby can argue that they were carrying out government policy and therefore deserve civil immunity, Mr. Turley said.

Trying Times For Wilsons, Too (WP)

By David Montgomery

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

Joe Wilson was at the Bombay Club, two blocks from the White House, waiting to have lunch shortly after noon yesterday with a friend and former National Security Council staffer, when his BlackBerry rang. It was his wife. She skipped right over "Hello."

"Four out of five. Guilty," Valerie Plame Wilson said evenly.

"There you go," Wilson recalls responding, with the same understatement.

He did not, he says, let out a whoop and dash around the swank Indian restaurant exchanging high-fives. But the conviction of I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby was a vicarious victory for the couple, the close of a chapter in their 3 1/2 -year struggle to hold government officials to account for what they say was a smear campaign against them and a coverup of bogus reasons for taking the nation to war.

And it was the beginning of a busy, blurry day for Joe Wilson, the former acting ambassador to Iraq, whose 2002 report debunking claims that Saddam Hussein sought nuclear materials from Niger started the whole drama.

DOJ_NMG_0141489

"I don't take any satisfaction in other people's trials and tribulations," Wilson said. "I would hope that the administration would learn from this that the abuse of the public trust to engage in personal political vendettas is inappropriate."

And yet he was definitely in a good mood. As he told NBC during an afternoon round-robin marathon of interviews in the offices of his lawyers, "I think we will sleep better tonight, knowing the jury has done its job and knowing Mr. Libby is a convicted felon." And his wife? "She wept," Wilson said later.

That BlackBerry call cut short his lunch, and Wilson went home to change into a double-breasted gray suit, raspberry tie and black ankle-high boots. Then he reported to the spare office suite at the corner of 14th and I streets NW that is home to Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington, the legal watchdog group handling the Wilsons' civil suit against Libby, Vice President Cheney, presidential aide Karl Rove and former deputy secretary of state Richard Armitage.

If this trial has provided evidence of just how expertly the administration could command the press's attention, it also has offered new media ops for this administration archnemesis.

First came the teleconference with print and radio reporters, then three offices in the suite were cleared for TV crews to set up. The space filled with filtered lights, cables snaking under doors, equipment dollies and a rotating cast from various networks.

Wilson drifted between the rooms, his suit coat open, holding a cup of water, giving an interview in one room while crews were setting up in the other two. There was a smile on his face. It was not a gloating smile, but it was a smile of great contentment.

As for who might play him and his wife in the Hollywood movie that's reportedly in the works, he said, "I only ask that Jack Black be cast in a role other than that of Joe Wilson."

With his affect of courtly cheer and his silver hair swept long in back, he looked every bit the cosmopolitan free spirit who at the height of the flap appeared in a Vanity Fair photo spread with his wife, all glammed up. But sitting down to answer the same questions again and again, now professorial in his spectacles and his prim white pocket square, he stuck to a solemn, almost melodramatically constitutional message.

"We really see this as a reaffirmation that this is a nation of laws," he said. "We live in a great democracy. That was demonstrated by this trial and the verdict, that no man is above the law.

"If you take the time to look at the testimony, it makes very clear the extent to which senior officials within this administration embarked on a disinformation campaign, the justification of which was to cover up the lies they said in the first place. And the methodology used was to engage in an unprecedented smear campaign, which would have succeeded had it not been illegal to divulge the name of a covert officer."

But Libby was convicted only of lying, and no one was convicted of that other stuff.

"Al Capone was convicted of tax evasion," came the practiced argument. "That doesn't mean he wasn't a racketeer."

The formerly classified woman, Valerie Plame Wilson, was nowhere to be seen. She was at their home in the Foxhall neighborhood, Wilson said, putting the finishing touches on her book and taking care of their 7-year-old twins. The family plans to move shortly to New Mexico.

Arguments on the Wilsons' civil suit are scheduled for May in U.S. District Court. The couple are seeking unspecified monetary damages from the four officials for violating their constitutional rights by allegedly retaliating against them. Wilson and Melanie Sloan, executive director of the legal group, said they want to hold officials accountable and use the discovery process to expose government actions in the run-up to war.

The couple, as Joe Wilson pointed out, "served our country for a combination of 45 years." He was acting ambassador to Iraq when Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait; his lunch partner yesterday was the one who notified him of the invasion. Wilson was later named ambassador to two small African nations by George H.W. Bush, who had hailed his courage in sheltering and helping to free U.S. citizens in Baghdad before the Gulf War started. He also served as senior director for African affairs in the Clinton White House.

Hearing that President Bush had expressed sympathy for Libby, Wilson called on the president to "express his sorrow to my wife, whose career was destroyed."

He also said, "The president ought to live up to his word and fire Mr. Rove."

One part of Wilson's message evolved over the day, his attitude toward a possible presidential pardon for Libby. In the teleconference he said, "I'm a firm believer in the Constitution, which accords the president the power of pardon."

In later interviews he said, "On reflection," Bush had a conflict of interest, and so "there's no place in a case like this for the use of a presidential pardon."

Last night he was scheduled for three more network appearances, with Keith Olbermann, Larry King and Anderson Cooper.

As the afternoon was winding down, a law-firm staffer said a radio producer had called seeking a morning interview. Not possible.

DOJ_NMG_0141490

"I'm supposed to be doing something with Diane Rehm tomorrow," Wilson said.

But for now, he was going back home to take an aspirin.

The conviction of Scooter Libby was giving Joe Wilson a headache.

The Libby Verdict (WP)

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

The serious consequences of a pointless Washington scandal

THE CONVICTION of I. Lewis Libby on charges of perjury, making false statements and obstruction of justice was grounded in strong evidence and what appeared to be careful deliberation by a jury. The former chief of staff to Vice President Cheney told the FBI and a grand jury that he had not leaked the identity of CIA employee Valerie Plame to journalists but rather had learned it from them. But abundant testimony at his trial showed that he had found out about Ms. Plame from official sources and was dedicated to discrediting her husband, former ambassador Joseph C. Wilson IV. Particularly for a senior government official, lying under oath is a serious offense. Mr. Libby's conviction should send a message to this and future administrations about the dangers of attempting to block official investigations.

The fall of this skilled and long-respected public servant is particularly sobering because it arose from a Washington scandal remarkable for its lack of substance. It was propelled not by actual wrongdoing but by inflated and frequently false claims, and by the aggressive and occasionally reckless response of senior Bush administration officials -- culminating in Mr. Libby's perjury.

Mr. Wilson was embraced by many because he was early in publicly charging that the Bush administration had "twisted," if not invented, facts in making the case for war against Iraq. In conversations with journalists or in a July 6, 2003, op-ed, he claimed to have debunked evidence that Iraq was seeking uranium from Niger; suggested that he had been dispatched by Mr. Cheney to look into the matter; and alleged that his report had circulated at the highest levels of the administration.

A bipartisan investigation by the Senate intelligence committee subsequently established that all of these claims were false -- and that Mr. Wilson was recommended for the Niger trip by Ms. Plame, his wife. When this fact, along with Ms. Plame's name, was disclosed in a column by Robert D. Novak, Mr. Wilson advanced yet another sensational charge: that his wife was a covert CIA operative and that senior White House officials had orchestrated the leak of her name to destroy her career and thus punish Mr. Wilson.

The partisan furor over this allegation led to the appointment of special prosecutor Patrick J. Fitzgerald. Yet after two years of investigation, Mr. Fitzgerald charged no one with a crime for leaking Ms. Plame's name. In fact, he learned early on that Mr. Novak's primary source was former deputy secretary of state Richard L. Armitage, an unlikely tool of the White House. The trial has provided convincing evidence that there was no conspiracy to punish Mr. Wilson by leaking Ms. Plame's identity -- and no evidence that she was, in fact, covert.

It would have been sensible for Mr. Fitzgerald to end his investigation after learning about Mr. Armitage. Instead, like many Washington special prosecutors before him, he pressed on, pursuing every tangent in the case. In so doing he unnecessarily subjected numerous journalists to the ordeal of having to disclose confidential sources or face imprisonment. One, Judith Miller of the New York Times, lost several court appeals and spent 85 days in jail before agreeing to testify. The damage done to journalists' ability to obtain information from confidential government sources has yet to be measured.

Mr. Wilson's case has besmirched nearly everyone it touched. The former ambassador will be remembered as a blowhard. Mr. Cheney and Mr. Libby were overbearing in their zeal to rebut Mr. Wilson and careless in their handling of classified information. Mr. Libby's subsequent false statements were reprehensible. And Mr. Fitzgerald has shown again why handing a Washington political case to a federal special prosecutor is a prescription for excess.

Mr. Fitzgerald was, at least, right about one thing: The Wilson-Plame case, and Mr. Libby's conviction, tell us nothing about the war in Iraq.

A Libby Verdict (NYT)

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

There will be a great deal written and said in coming days about the frustrations of the Scooter Libby verdict — that it did not tell us whether someone deliberately blew Valerie Plame Wilson's cover or erase serious concerns about the prosecutor's abuse of the First Amendment. Let's focus first on what the verdict does say.

One of the most senior officials in the White House, Lewis Libby, the chief of staff for Vice President Dick Cheney, was caught lying to the F.B.I. He appears to have been trying to cover up a smear campaign that was orchestrated by his boss against the first person to unmask one of the many untruths that President Bush used to justify invading Iraq. He was charged

DOJ_NMG_0141491

with those crimes, defended by the best lawyers he could get, tried in an open courtroom and convicted of serious felonies. Mr. Libby walked freely out of the court, had his say in public and will be allowed to appeal.

It was another reminder of how precious the American judicial system is, at a time when it is under serious attack from the same administration Mr. Libby served. That administration is systematically denying the right of counsel, the right to evidence and even the right to be tried to scores of prisoners who may have committed no crimes at all.

And although we still do not know the answer to the original mystery, the case provided a look at the methodical way that Mr. Cheney, Mr. Libby, Karl Rove and others in the Bush inner circle set out to discredit Ms. Wilson's husband, Joseph Wilson IV. Mr. Wilson, a career diplomat, was sent by the State Department in 2002 to check out a British intelligence report that Iraq had tried to buy uranium from the government of Niger for a secret nuclear weapons program. In his 2003 State of the Union address, Mr. Bush said: "The British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa."

In July 2003, Mr. Wilson wrote in an Op-Ed article in The Times that what he had found did not support that claim. The specter of a nuclear-armed Iraq was central to Mr. Bush's case for rushing to war. So, the trial testimony showed, Mr. Cheney orchestrated an assault on Mr. Wilson's credibility with the help of Mr. Libby and others. They whispered to journalists that Mr. Wilson's wife worked at the C.I.A. and that nepotism was the reason he had been chosen for the trip.

That is what we know from the Libby trial, and it is some of the clearest evidence yet that this administration did not get duped by faulty intelligence; at the very least, it cherry-picked and hyped intelligence to justify the war. What Mr. Wilson found, and subsequent investigations confirmed, was that there was one trip in 1999 — not "recently," but four years before Mr. Bush's statement — by an Iraqi official to Niger and that during that trip, uranium was never discussed.

What we still do not know is whether a government official used Ms. Wilson's name despite knowing that she worked undercover. That is a serious offense, which could have put her and all those who had worked with her in danger. We also do not understand why the federal prosecutor, Patrick Fitzgerald, chose to wage war with the news media in assembling his case, going so far as to jail a Times reporter, Judith Miller, for refusing to reveal the name of a confidential source.

The potential damage from that decision remains of real concern. But it was still a breath of fresh air to see someone in this administration, which specializes in secrecy, prevarication and evading blame, finally called to account.

Not All Sources Are Equal (NYT)

By Anthony Lewis

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

THE conviction yesterday of I. Lewis Libby Jr. on perjury and other charges, after a trial with a parade of press witnesses, leaves a legacy of intensified concern about legal proceedings that force journalists to disclose confidential sources. It is a legitimate and urgent concern. Without the ability to promise confidentiality, the press would have been unable to report notorious abuses of government power from Watergate through the Bush administration's violations of fundamental rights in the "war on terror."

But it is much easier to see the danger than to agree on a way to stop it. That is because there are compelling interests on both sides of the problem, as many in the press are loath to admit.

Consider libel. In its 1964 decision, New York Times v. Sullivan, the Supreme Court held that public officials (and, by a later decision, public figures) could not recover damages in a libel suit unless they proved that someone had published a falsehood about them knowingly or recklessly. The court defined recklessly to mean that the author of the falsehood was aware of its probable untruth. That gave the press enormous protection.

Suppose that a federal shield law — the kind of statute that many in the press have been urging Congress to enact — gave journalists an absolute right not to disclose confidential sources. Then a reckless journalist could write that according to a confidential source, a cabinet member had taken a bribe or a Hollywood star had sexually abused a child actor — and the victim of the article would be unable to show that the source was biased or that the reporter had misused the information. The victim would effectively be barred from recovering damages for the grave injury to his or her reputation.

These are not fanciful possibilities. Think about the case of Wen Ho Lee, the government scientist who was described in various press reports as a spy for China. He was arrested, charged with 59 felony counts and held in solitary confinement for nine months. Eventually the government dropped all the counts but one, a charge that he had mishandled information retroactively classified as "secret" after he was fired, and he pleaded guilty to that. The judge who accepted the plea apologized to Mr. Lee and said officials had "embarrassed our entire nation."

Wen Ho Lee sued the government for violation of his privacy in leaks to the press. The Boston Globe said in an editorial that the leaks came from an official "with a reputation for right-wing zealotry and racist behavior." But when reporters were subpoenaed and asked to name their sources, they understandably resisted.

DOJ_NMG_0141492

In that situation, would it have been right for the journalists to have an absolute privilege against having to testify? Then Mr. Lee would have had no recourse. I do not think a decent society should give that answer.

The remedy in such a civil case is not to put reporters in jail in order to force them to testify. It is, rather, to make the press pay for the injury it caused. And that is what actually happened in the Lee case. Five news organizations, including The Times, agreed to pay Wen Ho Lee $750,000 altogether — which they said was not to compensate him for his injury but to protect their journalists and the right to confidential sources. And the government contributed $895,000 toward Mr. Lee's legal fees.

I do not think the press can have both the Sullivan decision and a privilege not to testify in civil cases. Otherwise the decision would be a license for reckless or even deliberate falsification, which the author of the Sullivan opinion, Justice William J. Brennan Jr., certainly did not favor.

Criminal prosecutions raise different problems. Prosecutors used to shy away, generally, from pressing journalists to name sources. But lately they are doing so with increasing frequency. Why? Perhaps because the press does not have as much support in public opinion as it used to. Whatever the reason, the danger of crippling the investigative function of journalism is increasing.

Congress seems unlikely to give the press what it wants, an absolute shield against having to testify in federal cases. To increase the chance of passage, it has been suggested that shield legislation include an exception allowing journalists to be subpoenaed when there is an imminent threat to national security.

That exception seems to me to invite trouble. The most important press disclosures in our time have had to do with what the government claims is national security: The New York Times's disclosure of President Bush's order to wiretap without warrants in violation of law, for example, and The Washington Post's reports about secret Central Intelligence Agency prisons.

The government is always quick to claim that the national security sky will fall if a story is published. It did so, notoriously, in the Pentagon Papers case. And judges are too often overawed by such claims. A recent example was the shameful decision by the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit that the doctrine of "state secrets" barred a man who showed convincingly that he was kidnapped and abused by the C.I.A. from suing.

There is also the possibility that a criminal defendant, rather than the prosecution, will ask for a journalist's testimony. If that testimony might in fact be helpful, should the law allow the journalist to be silent and the defendant to be convicted? Even if the press had an absolute privilege, I think the courts would free the defendant because he was denied a fair opportunity to make his defense.

Or consider the recent case of two San Francisco Chronicle reporters who quoted documents from a grand jury investigating drug use by major league baseball players. The reporters refused to disclose their source for the documents, but were saved from jail when federal prosecutors unearthed the source themselves. He was a lawyer who had represented defendants indicted by the grand jury — and who had then demanded that the charges against his clients be dismissed when the story based on his leak appeared. Do we want to protect that kind of trickery? Surely, many journalists would not.

THOSE are some of the conflicting interests at stake on the issue of a testimonial privilege for the press. Can Congress figure them all out in a qualified privilege statute specifying in detail when journalists should have a privilege? I doubt it. I think a statute will have to leave the balancing of interests to be done by judges, case by case.

One respected judge, David Tatel of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, has made a wise proposal. It is that the courts use their power to define privileges — a power affirmed by statute — to give a qualified privilege to journalists.

Judge Tatel's proposal is aimed at the typical leak case: when a federal prosecutor is trying to find the source of a leak and subpoenas journalists. Judge Tatel suggests that a judge in this situation should weigh the public interest in the leaked material against the damage alleged by the government. If the leak were, say, the fact of the government's lawless wiretapping, it is easy for me to see that the public interest should prevail.

Judges are not always wise. But in our system they are the ones we trust to weigh acutely conflicting interests. In the wake of the Libby case, Congress should pass legislation that makes clear the public interest in journalists' confidentiality but leaves it to judges to weigh that against other social necessities.

A Case Of Bad Ink: Portrait Of Media Is Not So Flattering (WP)

By Howard Kurtz

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

The parade of high-profile Washington journalists who took the stand in the Lewis "Scooter" Libby perjury case were not on trial. But few would dispute that the proceedings, which ended with Libby's conviction on four of five counts yesterday, gave their profession a black eye.

DOJ_NMG_0141493

When Vice President Cheney's chief of staff and other top administration officials wanted to neutralize a critic by disclosing his wife's role at the CIA, they turned to some of the capital's most prominent chroniclers, who -- under longstanding local custom -- promised the leakers anonymity.

"There is an all-too-unsettling nexus between the political and media elite," says Jim Warren, a Chicago Tribune managing editor. "This was a nice little window into the mutual obsession with one another. There's the infatuation with power which we all have and which was vividly underscored, especially those of us at elite institutions."

Jackie Judd, who covered the Monica Lewinsky investigation for ABC News, says the tight relationship between journalists and their sources seems to survive each passing scandal.

"We're always used," says Judd, now with the Kaiser Family Foundation. "Someone always has a motivation for talking to a reporter. . . . This was an obvious case of the administration trying to use reporters to do a smear job on Joe Wilson and his wife."

The case, in which special prosecutor Patrick Fitzgerald forced journalists to testify by using the threat of prison, was also a setback for media arguments that such testimony jeopardizes important newsgathering. "We do not think that what Libby was telling reporters was whistle-blowing," Fitzgerald said yesterday, adding that subpoenaing journalists "should be a last resort."

In their dealings with journalists, top administration officials were shielded by a curtain of anonymity so opaque that Libby asked Judith Miller, then a New York Times reporter, to identify him only as a "former Hill staffer," then was disappointed when she failed to write a story. Such pledges of anonymity helped mask efforts, orchestrated by Cheney, to neutralize Wilson's criticism of the administration's claims that Saddam Hussein was pursuing illicit weapons.

The one plus for the media in Libby's conviction involved Tim Russert, NBC's Washington bureau chief, since the case turned on his credibility. The Libby defense was built around his contention that he learned about CIA operative Valerie Plame from Russert and, therefore, believed it was widely known, but the "Meet the Press" host insisted that it never came up in their conversation. The jury believed Russert.

The searing spotlight on how reporters do their jobs was less than flattering. Miller said she lost one of her notebooks and couldn't remember the names of the other sources she said had told her about Plame. Former Time correspondent Matt Cooper, who wrote a piece questioning whether the administration had "declared war" on Wilson, had trouble deciphering his own notes. Bob Woodward, the Washington Post editor and author, apologized to his boss for failing to disclose for more than two years that former deputy secretary of state Richard Armitage had told him about Plame.

Russert was pressed on why he was willing to tell an FBI agent about his conversation with Libby but balked at a prosecutor's subpoena. And syndicated columnist Robert Novak, the man who outed Plame, refused to say for three years whether he had even testified in the case, before it emerged that he had talked to Fitzgerald.

"We all saw how sloppy reporters can be in their note-taking," says Jeralyn Merritt, an attorney and blogger who covered the trial for her Web site TalkLeft. "When you hear them say, 'I don't recall, I don't recall' when asked about their notes for an article, you wonder about their accuracy."

There was considerable sympathy for Miller when she went to jail for 85 days. But when Miller, like other journalists in the case, later testified under a waiver of confidentiality granted by Libby, many analysts wondered just what the First Amendment battle had been about.

"Fitzgerald has created a terrible precedent here with his use of waivers to force [journalists] to testify," says Byron York, who covered the trial for National Review. "That's got to have a chilling effect." He says an "air of coercion" surrounded the ostensibly voluntary waivers from administration officials.

Russert said on NBC last night that he is "concerned we not create a pattern" of journalists being compelled to testify, "but when you are called, you tell the truth."

Bob Zelnick, a Boston University journalism professor, sees "a self-inflicted wound by the mainstream media," which greeted the 2003 Novak column that disclosed Plame's secret CIA connection with "howls of outrage" and demands for investigation. The uproar led to Fitzgerald's appointment.

"Fitzgerald was overzealous," Zelnick says, and "the effect is serious and adverse. It's going to take a long time for reporters and their sources to figure out how to deal with each other in a way that doesn't risk contempt citations and imprisonment." At the same time, Zelnick says he couldn't have broken the stories he did as a Pentagon reporter without relying on unnamed sources.

The administration's selection of reporters to leak to was carefully choreographed. Washington Post reporter Walter Pincus, who covers national security, testified that then-press secretary Ari Fleischer "swerved off" during a conversation and told him about Plame. Libby testified that Cheney "instructed me to go and talk to Judith Miller and lay this out for her," using previously secret information that Cheney had President Bush declassify.

DOJ_NMG_0141494

"It's very troubling that there's this cabal," says Merritt, who criticized Miller's 2002 and 2003 reports on whether Iraq had weapons of mass destruction, some of which turned out to be wrong. "It's not so much that administration officials share information with reporters. It's that they pick reporters who they think are going to spin it their way."

Although the controversy involved the White House and the case for war, reporters at every city hall and statehouse in the country face a similar dilemma: How can they cultivate the right people to get scoops without compromising their independence?

"Editors so prize access and the fruits of that access that we don't stop often enough to think 'Is so-and-so getting too close to the people he covers?' " says the Tribune's Warren. "It could be the person at the cop shop in town."

If there's one saving grace for the news business, it's that much of the public long ago tuned out the intricate case. "My guess," Judd says, "is there's not a huge amount of interest in this story outside the Beltway."

Computer Profs Urge Independent Investigator In Teacher Porn Case (AP)

AP, March 7, 2007

HARTFORD, Conn. --Nearly 30 Connecticut computer science professors have signed a letter urging an independent investigation in the case of a Norwich substitute teacher convicted of exposing her students to pornography on a classroom computer.

The professors, from eight Connecticut colleges and universities, took out an ad in Tuesday's Hartford Courant on behalf of Julie Amero, a 40-year-old Windham resident with no prior criminal record.

Amero was convicted in January of four counts of risk of injury to a minor and faces up to 40 years in prison when she is sentenced March 29.

While prosecutors insist she is guilty, some experts believe that the lewd images were caused by unseen spyware and adware programs, which critics call one of the top scourges of the Internet.

Amero, who claims to have little experience with computers, has become a cause celebre for technology experts around the country who say she is the victim of a miscarriage of justice that could happen to anyone.

"The Julie Amero case has created outrage in Internet forums and among computer experts all over the country," the professors wrote in their ad, which was titled "An Open Letter to Chief State's Attorney Kevin T. Kane."

The 28 professors who signed the letter advocate a suggestion from Mark Rasch, former chief of the U.S. Department of Justice cyber crime unit, that an independent investigator be brought in to look at the case.

Kane's office declined comment Tuesday.

The case started in October 2004, when Amero was assigned to a class of seventh-graders, a few of whom had been looking at a Web site on hair styles. Amero says that after class started, pornographic images started popping up on the computer screen by themselves and she could not stop them. She says she was under strict orders to leave the computer on.

Prosecutors say Amero clicked on to graphic Web sites and failed to prevent children from seeing pornography. Amero says she did not click on the Web pages and that inappropriate images were from adware, which can generate pop-up ads.

Amero and her supporters say the old computer lacked firewall or antispyware protections to prevent inappropriate pop-ups.

In ’05 Investing, Obama Took Same Path As Donors (NYT)

By Mike Mcintire And Christopher Drew

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

Less than two months after ascending to the United States Senate, Barack Obama bought more than $50,000 worth of stock in two speculative companies whose major investors included some of his biggest political donors.

One of the companies was a biotech concern that was starting to develop a drug to treat avian flu. In March 2005, two weeks after buying about $5,000 of its shares, Mr. Obama took the lead in a legislative push for more federal spending to battle the disease.

The most recent financial disclosure form for Mr. Obama, an Illinois Democrat, also shows that he bought more than $50,000 in stock in a satellite communications business whose principal backers include four friends and donors who had raised more than $150,000 for his political committees.

A spokesman for Mr. Obama, who is seeking his party’s presidential nomination in 2008, said yesterday that the senator did not know that he had invested in either company until fall 2005, when he learned of it and decided to sell the stocks. He sold them at a net loss of $13,000.

The spokesman, Bill Burton, said Mr. Obama’s broker bought the stocks without consulting the senator, under the terms of a blind trust that was being set up for the senator at that time but was not finalized until several months after the investments were made.

DOJ_NMG_0141495

"He went about this process to avoid an actual or apparent conflict of interest, and he had no knowledge of the stocks he owned," Mr. Burton said. "And when he realized that he didn't have the level of blindness that he expected, he moved to terminate the trust."

Mr. Obama has made ethics a signature issue, and his quest for the presidency has benefited from the perception that he is unlike politicians who blend public and private interests. There is no evidence that any of his actions ended up benefiting either company during the roughly eight months that he owned the stocks.

Even so, the stock purchases raise questions about how he could unwittingly come to invest in two relatively obscure companies, whose backers happen to include generous contributors to his political committees. Among those donors was Jared Abbruzzese, a New York businessman now at the center of an F.B.I. inquiry into public corruption in Albany, who had also contributed to Swift Boat Veterans for Truth, a group that sought to undermine John Kerry's Democratic presidential campaign in 2004.

Mr. Obama, who declined to be interviewed about the stock deals, has already had to contend with a controversy that arose out of his reliance on a major campaign contributor in Chicago to help him in a personal financial transaction. In that earlier case, he acknowledged last year that it had been a mistake to involve the contributor, a developer who has since been indicted in an unrelated political scandal, in deals related to the Obamas' purchase of a home.

Senate ethics rules do not prohibit lawmakers from owning stocks — even in companies that do business with the federal government or could benefit from legislation they advance — and indeed other members of Congress have investments in government contractors. The rules say only that lawmakers should not take legislative actions whose primary purpose is to benefit themselves.

Mr. Obama's sale of his shares in the two companies ended what appears to have been a brief foray into highly speculative investing that stood out amid an otherwise conservative portfolio of mutual funds and cash accounts, a review of his Senate disclosure statements shows. He earned $2,000 on the biotech company, AVI BioPharma, and lost $15,000 on the satellite communications concern, Skyterra, according to Mr. Burton of the Obama campaign.

Mr. Burton said the trust was different from qualified blind trusts that other senators commonly used, because it was intended to allow him greater flexibility to address any accusations of conflicts that might arise from its assets. He said Mr. Obama had decided to sell the stocks after receiving a communication that made him concerned about how the trust was set up.

The investments came at a time when Mr. Obama was enjoying sudden financial success, following his victory at the polls in November 2004. He had signed a $1.9 million book deal, and his ethics disclosure reports show that he received $1.2 million of book money in 2005.

His wife, Michelle, a hospital vice president in Chicago, received a promotion that March, nearly tripling her salary to $317,000, and they bought a $1.6 million house in June. The house sat on a large property that was subdivided to make it more affordable, and one of Mr. Obama's political donors bought the adjacent lot.

The disclosure forms show that the Obamas also placed several hundred thousand dollars in a new private-client account at JPMorgan Chase, a bond fund and a checking account at a Chicago bank.

But he put $50,000 to $100,000 into an account at UBS, which his aides say was recommended to him by a wealthy friend, George W. Haywood, who was also a major investor in both Skyterra and AVI BioPharma, public securities filings show.

Mr. Haywood and his wife, Cheryl, have contributed close to $50,000 to Mr. Obama's campaigns and to his political action committee, the Hopefund. Mr. Haywood declined to comment.

Within two weeks of his purchase of the biotech stock that Feb. 22, Mr. Obama initiated what he has called "one of my top priorities since arriving in the Senate," a push to increase federal financing to fight avian flu.

Several dozen people had already died from the disease in Southeast Asia, and experts were warning that a worldwide pandemic could kill tens of millions of people. Mr. Obama was one of the first political leaders to call for more money to head off the danger, which he described as an urgent public health threat.

His first step came on March 4, 2005, when the Senate Foreign Relations Committee approved his request for $25 million to help contain the disease in Asia; the full Senate later approved that measure. And in April 2005, he introduced a bill calling for more research on avian flu drugs and urging the government to increase its stockpiles of antiviral medicines.

Mr. Obama repeated this call in a letter that Aug. 9 to Michael O. Levitt, the health and human services secretary. And in September 2005, Mr. Obama and Senator Tom Harkin, Democrat of Iowa, succeeded in amending another bill to provide $3.8 billion for battling the flu.

Meanwhile, the drug company in which he invested, AVI BioPharma, had been working to develop its own medicine to treat avian flu victims. In a conference call with Wall Street analysts on March 8, 2005, the company's chairman, Denis R. Burger, said the firm was "aggressively going forward" with its avian flu research and hoped to work with federal agencies on it.

DOJ_NMG_0141496

The company, which is also developing medicines in a number of other areas, provided several updates on its avian flu research in 2005, including one on Oct. 21 saying the company was likely to develop a treatment for avian flu "in a relatively short time."

Mr. Obama sold what appears to have been about 2,000 shares of the company's stock a week later, when it traded at about $3.50 a share, or about $1 a share more than when he bought it. Company officials said they never talked to the senator about his work on avian flu. And while the company has received millions of dollars in federal money to develop drugs for treating ebola and other serious diseases, it still has not received any federal money for its avian flu research.

The company's stock briefly surged to nearly $9 a share in January 2006 when it announced promising research findings on the flu drug. But the company still has not applied for federal approvals to test and market the drug.

Unlike his investment in AVI, which yielded a small profit, Mr. Obama's stake in Skyterra Communications went in the opposite direction, despite a promising start.

He bought his Skyterra shares the same day the Federal Communications Commission ruled in favor of the company's effort to create a nationwide wireless network by combining satellites and land-based communications systems. Immediately after that morning ruling, Tejas Securities, a regional brokerage in Texas that handled investment banking for Skyterra, issued a research report speculating that Skyterra stock could triple in value.

Tejas and people associated with it were major donors to Mr. Obama's political committees, having raised more than $150,000 since 2004. The company's chairman, John J. Gorman, has held fund-raisers for the senator in Austin, Tex., and arranged for him to use a private plane for several political events in 2005. Mr. Gorman declined to comment.

In May 2005, Mr. Abbruzzese, who was vice chairman of Tejas and a principal investor in Skyterra, contributed $10,000 along with his wife to Mr. Obama's political action committee — a departure from his almost exclusive support of Republicans. Eight months earlier, for instance, he had contributed $5,000 to the Swift Boat group, and he has given $100,000 to the Republican National Committee since 2004.

Last year, Mr. Abbruzzese, a major investor in several high-tech companies in New York and elsewhere, emerged as a central figure in the federal investigation of the New York State Senate majority leader, Joseph L. Bruno. The inquiry is examining Mr. Bruno's personal business dealings, including whether he accepted money from Mr. Abbruzzese in return for Senate approval of grants for one of Mr. Abbruzzese's companies. Both men have denied any wrongdoing. Mr. Abbruzzese did not return phone calls seeking comment.

Skyterra's share price was lifted into the $40 range for a time on the strength of the F.C.C. ruling, but eventually drifted down into the low 30s, and was at $31 when Mr. Obama sold his shares for a $15,000 loss on Nov. 1, 2005. A few months later, it plunged into the $20 range, and today trades below $10 a share. A spokesman for Skyterra said the company's top officials had not been aware of Mr. Obama's investment.

Nevada Governor Discloses Legal Defense Fund Contributors (AP)

By Brendan Riley, ASSOCIATED PRESS

AP, March 7, 2007

CARSON CITY, Nev. (AP) - About four months after a defense fund was set up for Nevada Gov. Jim Gibbons to help cover costs of brewing legal cases - including a woman's claim he assaulted her - Gibbons on Tuesday disclosed the fund's 2006 contributors and the $169,100 they gave.

The money went into a fund that wasn't sanctioned by a House committee even though Gibbons was still a congressman. But Gibbons stated "it is not clear what rules govern that fund." He also stated that he wanted to "make sure there is as much disclosure as possible."

The newly elected Republican governor now has two high-priced lawyers handling an FBI probe into his associations with a longtime friend who's a wealthy federal contractor. The contribution report covers a time period prior to confirmation of the FBI investigation.

The big donors in 2006 include prominent several doctors in the Nevada Heart and Vascular Center in Las Vegas for $35,000; Nevada attorney and developer Harvey Whittemore, for $30,000 through companies he controls; and Las Vegas businessman Shawn Lampman for $20,000.

Sig Rogich, Gibbons' campaign adviser, kicked in $10,000. So did lobbyist and former casino lobbyist Jay Brown.

The report filed with the secretary of state's office also shows that the defense fund paid $92,561 to lawyers in 2006, leaving the fund with $76,539 at the end of the year.

Gibbons spokeswoman Melissa Subbotin said Monday that a U.S. House committee's approval of the defense fund wasn't sought in November because Gibbons, a Republican who served five terms in the House, was seeking election to a state office and not a federal office.

Subbotin also said any leftover money would be donated to the Nevada Patriot Fund, set up to help families who lost a soldier in the Iraq war.

Attorney Michael Pagni, who helped to set up the defense fund, said the federal rules didn't come up for discussion at the time. He added that such rules generally "don't apply to a candidate for state office even if he's a federal officeholder at the time."

The U.S. House rules state that legal expense funds can be set up to handle expenses stemming from campaigns for federal office or from a House member's official duties, but must be authorized by the House Ethics Committee.

The rules also state that the funds can be used to defray "a criminal prosecution; or a civil matter bearing on the individual's reputation or fitness for office."

If the legal defense fund had been set up under House rules, quarterly reports on contributions would have been required, and the first report would have been due Jan. 30. There are no state laws requiring such disclosures.

While Gibbons maintains the defense fund was set up properly, there may be some practical problems created by the state law barring political contributions a month before, during and a month after Nevada's legislative sessions. It covers a period from early January to early July this year.

But Pagni said his reading of the state law is that it wouldn't conflict with the purpose of the legal defense fund, which "would come under personal use."

Attorneys Don Campbell of Las Vegas and Abbe Lowell of Washington, D.C., currently are helping Gibbons deal with FBI questions about his associations with Warren Trepp. Gibbons has denied that he accepted payments or gifts from Trepp in exchange for helping the wealthy Reno software contractor get defense contracts while Gibbons was a member of Congress.

Trepp, a former chief trader for convicted junk-bond dealer Michael Milken, also has denied any wrongdoing.

Lowell has defended many high-profile clients, including now-imprisoned lobbyist Jack Abramoff. Campbell, a well-known Nevada criminal defense lawyer, helped Gibbons when he was accused just before the November elections by Chrissy Mazzeo of assaulting her. Authorities decided against filing charges in that case.

Troha Tax Bills Got Special Attention From State (MJS)

By Cary Spivak And Patrick Marley

Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, March 7, 2007

Transportation office put 2 workers on case of indicted donor's $1 million in charges

Madison - Wisconsin Transportation Secretary Frank Busalacchi met with a now-indicted contributor to Gov. Jim Doyle in 2004 and directed two state employees to lend a hand in settling nearly $1 million in out-of-state tax bills to the donor's trucking companies.

The move by Busalacchi, who serves at Doyle's pleasure, provided Dennis Troha's companies with virtually unprecedented state help in Troha's bid to whittle down the tax bill. The five-year-old case is still pending before the state Tax Appeals Commission.

Busalacchi met with Troha in April 2004 and later dispatched an attorney and auditor to Illinois as Troha tried to lessen his companies' fuel tax liabilities, according to about 100 pages of e-mails obtained by the Journal Sentinel this week. The meeting occurred about 1 1/2 years after the DOT lawyer concluded that there was no reason to dismiss the tax assessed against the Troha firms.

In addition, Busalacchi sent the lawyer to Harrisburg, Pa., even though the attorney's superior complained that there was no funding in the budget for the trip.

The unusual effort has caught the interest of the FBI, which talked to a department auditor Tuesday about the matter and arranged a more thorough interview for today.

Top DOT officials and a Doyle spokesman vigorously defended the efforts as proper.

"It is completely appropriate for the Department of Transportation to help settle disputes on behalf of other states, and that's what happened here," said Matt Canter, a spokesman for the Democratic governor.

Robert Jambois, the department's chief counsel, said staff attorney Paul Nilsen was sent to Illinois and Pennsylvania so he could have a better understanding of the issues at hand.

But in a Sept. 14, 2004, e-mail, then-chief counsel Jim Thiel said Nilsen went there because Busalacchi promised Troha's attorney, Bill Jennaro, he would do so. Jennaro was hired by Doyle in 2003 to help negotiate casino compacts with Indian tribes, some of which opposed Troha's efforts to open a mega-casino in Kenosha.

In saying the handling of the case was not unusual, Jambois noted that DOT employees went to Georgia in 2001 when Schneider National, a giant Green Bay trucking firm, was involved in a dispute with that state. He did not know whether then-Republican Transportation Secretary Terry Mulcahy met with Schneider executives.

DOJ_NMG_0141498

Two retired Department of Transportation officials said Tuesday they could not remember officials giving similar treatment to other firms that challenged their tax bills. Close connections

Troha and family members have given $200,000 to Doyle's campaigns since 2002. And connections between the Doyle administration and Troha have long been controversial in some political circles.

The spotlight fell on those connections last week when Troha was indicted by a federal grand jury. He is accused of exceeding state contribution limits in funneling money through relatives to Doyle and lying to the FBI about it. Troha gave the money at the same time he was trying to win approval of a proposed Menominee tribal casino at Dairyland Greyhound Park in Kenosha, the indictment charges.

Troha abruptly pulled out of the casino deal a week before he was indicted.

He sold all his trucking company interests last year so he could focus his time and money on the $808 million casino project.

In 2002, the Department of Transportation determined that three firms then owned by Troha - John Houston Corp. & Transport Venture, Auto Truck Transport Corp. and Unimark Services Inc. - owed close to $1 million in fuel taxes to other states. Under an international agreement, each of the 48 contiguous states collects fuel taxes for each other for trucking companies headquartered in their home states.

Reached on his cell phone Tuesday, Troha declined to discuss the matter.

"It's inappropriate for me to comment," Troha said before hanging up on reporters.

Thom Rabaglia, a DOT auditor for fuel taxes, said the companies were trying to exploit loopholes in other states' laws to get out of paying all their taxes.

Rabaglia, the chief auditor who accompanied Nilsen to Springfield, Ill., said he was briefly interviewed Tuesday by the FBI and was set for a more in-depth interview today.

Records obtained this week detail for the first time the efforts of Transportation Department staffers to assist Troha's companies, even though a department attorney initially said there was "no legal basis for dismissing the tax."

The e-mails show:

¦ Busalacchi met with Troha and Jennaro at the Amtrak station in Milwaukee in April 2004. The secretary demanded that his chief counsel, not just a lower-ranking attorney, attend the meeting.

¦ Busalacchi insisted that Nilsen go to Harrisburg even though Thiel said there was no money to do so.

"I think this is Frank's call - he made the commitment to Bill Jennaro," Thiel wrote in one e-mail.

The next day, the e-mails show, Busalacchi approved the trip for Nilsen and an auditor, though only Nilsen went to Harrisburg. Officials estimated the cost at less than $500.

DOT officials said Busalacchi was in budget meetings and unavailable Tuesday. Thiel declined comment. Nilsen did not return calls.

· Nilsen's role in Pennsylvania was to "facilitate a settlement" between the state and Troha's companies, Nilsen wrote.

Thomas Cantwell, who oversaw Wisconsin's fuel tax auditors until he retired in 2003, said few cases were appealed to the secretary's office during his 15-year tenure.

Alice Morehouse, the DOT's retired finance director, concurred, saying she could think of "no contest that elevated itself to this level."

Morehouse said Busalacchi, a former Teamsters leader, knew Troha well. She said Nilsen felt uncomfortable about the case but never said why.

"I would say Paul Nilsen is one of the straightest arrows on God's green earth, and I think he just felt uncomfortable," she said.

CONTACT US Got a story idea we should investigate? Send tips to watchdog@journalsentinel.com.

Buy a link here

More Questions Raised Over Casino Developer's Donations (STPPP)

By Scott Bauer

The St. Paul Pioneer-Press, March 7, 2007

MADISON, Wis. - As more questions are being raised about political donations tied to former casino developer Dennis Troha, Republicans in the state Assembly are reviving a bill that would give state lawmakers the authority to grant or deny new casinos.

Troha was indicted last week on charges that he committed fraud and lied to the FBI in relation to more than $100,000 in donations he and family members made to Gov. Jim Doyle and others. The indictment alleges Troha made the donations in an

attempt to win approval of a casino he had been developing in Kenosha. Troha backed out of the deal just six days before the indictment from U.S. Attorney Steve Biskupic was released Thursday.

Troha's arraignment on the charges is set for March 14.

Troha's attorney, Frank Gimbel, has said his client has done nothing wrong. Doyle said he would return any money found to have been given illegally.

Doyle received $200,000 in campaign donations from Troha and his family members between 2002 and 2006. Under current law, Doyle has the authority to grant or deny new casinos once they win federal approval. The governor has repeatedly said his decision would not be influenced by any donations he has received.

In a separate development, WKOW-TV in Madison has reported that Doyle received campaign contributions from employees of two Troha trucking firms three months after Wisconsin Department of Transportation officials traveled to Pennsylvania to try to help the firms settle a tax debt in that state.

A review of campaign finance records maintained by the Wisconsin Democracy Campaign showed that Doyle received $14,890 in January 2005 from seven donors - including three Troha relatives - who listed their employer as one of two Troha companies, JHT Holdings or ATC Leasing.

WKOW reported that the meeting in Pennsylvania was between Wisconsin officials, representatives of Troha's trucking firms, and officials with the Pennsylvania Revenue Department and attorney general's office.

"I'm unaware of any connection between an action on the part of state officials and any donation," said Troha's spokesman Jeff Fleming.

State DOT general counsel Bob Jambois said the October 2004 meeting was beneficial for the state to understand Pennsylvania's position in the tax case. Wisconsin officials also traveled to Georgia in 2001 in a similar case involving another trucking company, Jambois said. There have only been six such multistate tax cases since 2001, he said.

In the case involving Troha's trucking companies, Pennsylvania and Nevada both settled around December, Jambois said, leaving Illinois, Michigan and New Mexico. State officials also traveled to Illinois in April 2004, he said.

Jambois said the existing disputed taxes owed to those three states is about $500,000. The Wisconsin Tax Appeals Commission is currently considering a petition from the trucking firms challenging the amount owed. Under a multistate compact, the state in which a trucking firm is based is responsible for collecting motor fuel taxes and distributing amounts owed to other states.

Troha, 60, joined the former Kenosha Auto Transport in 1974 and later became a principal owner of its successor firm, ATC Leasing. That company later became a subsidiary of Troha's JHT Holdings Inc. He sold off a majority of that company to a private equity firm in February 2005. He severed all ties with JHT last year.

Also on Tuesday, Assembly Speaker Mike Huebsch, R-West Salem, said that a bill will be introduced again identical to one Doyle vetoed in May that would require the Legislature to sign off on new casinos, in addition to the governor. Huebsch predicted it would be debated by the Republican-controlled Assembly in April.

Doyle has been criticized by Republicans and others for changing positions on the governor's role in approving casinos. During the 2002 campaign, Doyle said he supported having the Legislature, and not the governor, determine whether a casino can be located in the state.

But once elected, Doyle changed his position and in May vetoed the legislative oversight bill. In his veto message, Doyle cited concerns about "inherent practical difficulties in involving multiple parties in the concurrence process."

Spokesmen for both Doyle and Senate Majority Leader Judy Robson, D-Beloit, did not immediately return messages seeking comment on the bill.

Green License Plates Proposed To Identify Ohio Sex Offenders (NYT)

By Bob Driehaus

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

CINCINNATI, March 6 — A bipartisan effort in Ohio's legislature could make the state the first to require convicted violent sex offenders and child predators to place fluorescent green license plates on their cars.

The legislation stems from a three-year effort by the friends and family of Kristen Jackson, 14, who was raped and killed in 2002 by a convicted sex offender who abducted her as she walked home from the Wayne County Fair in Wooster.

A 2005 bill that called for pink license plates for all sex offenders failed after critics deemed it too harsh and Mary Kay Cosmetics and advocates for breast cancer research objected to the color.

The revised bill would focus on convicted sex offenders who used violence or preyed on minors and would exclude other offenses like public exposure or consensual sex between an adult and a teenager.

DOJ_NMG_0141500

"It's about giving people the tools they need to make informed decisions for themselves and for their children," said State Senator Kevin Coughlin, a Cuyahoga Falls Republican, who joined with Representative Michael DeBose, a Cleveland Democrat, to introduce in each house a bill they call Kristen's Law.

A spokesman for Gov. Ted Strickland, a Democrat, said the governor would sign the measure if it was approved by the General Assembly.

Critics say the bill would wrongly punish the offenders' family members who use the cars with the special license plates and expose occupants of the car to vigilante justice.

"I certainly want to keep our children safe from sexual predators, but I worry about casting the scarlet A, instead of on Hester Prynne, around Hester Prynne's family," said Representative Bill Seitz, a suburban Cincinnati Republican and the majority whip. Mr. Seitz sponsored a law enacted in 2003 that barred sex offenders from living within 1,000 feet of a school.

Another opponent of the bill, Conrad Goode, who has worked with sex offenders as a parole officer and is now a coordinator at a Salvation Army halfway house in Dayton, said: "They've done their time. They've done their after-care. They have to register where they live. That's enough."

David Finkelhor, director of the Crimes against Children Research Center in Durham, N.H., said the debate about such proposals should focus on results rather than intentions.

"Before we really go a lot further with it, we have to see if it has the desired effect," Mr. Finkelhor said. "And these legislators are getting involved in implementing these ideas without any research to test their efficacy."

A better course, he said, would be experimenting with one county.

Sheryl Rusher, a Wooster resident and friend of Kristen Jackson's parents, has pushed for the bill for peace of mind for parents, arguing that Ohio already places special yellow license plates with red lettering on the cars of convicted drunken drivers.

"If we can put those plates on a D.U.I. driver's car," Ms. Rusher said, "then we should be able to put them on a sex offender's car."

Scruggs Offered Immunity In Bribery Trial (BSH)

Biloxi Sun Herald, March 7, 2007

STAFF AND WIRE REPORTS

JACKSON - The U.S. Justice Department has offered immunity from prosecution to attorney Richard "Dickie" Scruggs in exchange for his testimony in a judicial bribery trial involving his former colleague, Paul Minor.

Assistant U.S. Attorney Ruth Morgan, who is prosecuting Minor and two former state court judges on bribery charges, told U.S. District Court Judge Henry T. Wingate about the immunity deal Tuesday afternoon outside the jury's presence. Morgan said the prosecution expects to call Scruggs as one of the next four prosecution witnesses.

Scruggs also is currently at the center of negotiations on behalf of policyholders to settle Katrina claims with State Farm. He has been featured in local and national news stories about the proposed settlement, pending in U.S. District Court in Gulfport.

The judicial bribery trial is under way in Jackson, where Minor is accused of bribing former Circuit Judge John Whitfield and former Chancery Judge Wes Teel. Morgan said Scruggs has been granted immunity for testimony about a loan he paid off for Teel at Minor's request and about a loan guarantee for state Supreme Court Justice Oliver Diaz and his wife.

Oliver Diaz was acquitted at the end of the first judicial bribery trial in 2005. The jury was unable to reach a verdict on charges against Minor, Teel and Whitfield.

Minor later repaid Scruggs for his $27,500 payment on the Teel loan.

Morgan asked Wingate to limit any cross-examination of Scruggs. She fears attorneys for Minor and the judges will try to imply Scruggs was not prosecuted because he is U.S. Sen. Trent Lott's brother-in-law. They have raised those allegations in the past, but Wingate has not allowed selective prosecution to be raised as an issue before the jury.

Morgan told the judge, in response to his questions, that defense attorneys had just been notified of the Scruggs immunity offer. She said the Justice Department produced an immunity letter Monday, but Scruggs had not gotten a chance to sign it yet.

Wingate did not rule on Morgan's request to limit defense attorneys' questions of Scruggs.

"Selective prosecution is an issue that the court takes up," Wingate said. "But in this instance, I don't know what motivation the Justice Department had to give him immunity. So I don't know whether he was given any preferential treatment."

Also Tuesday, Minor's attorneys attempted to show a 2001 court settlement benefitting his client, The Peoples Bank, was legally sound and not influenced by his relationship with Teel.

Minor in 1998 guaranteed the bank loan for Teel and another for Whitfield at The People's Bank. After Minor filed suit for People's Bank against its insurer, USF&G, the case ended up in Teel's court.

Teel oversaw the settlement in which USF&G agreed to pay the bank about $1 million. The government alleges Teel was essentially being employed by Minor to inflate the settlement amount in favor of his client.

DOJ_NMG_0141501

Attorney Wayne Drinkwater, who represented USF&G, testified that the case was settled after he expressed pessimism about his client's chances of prevailing at trial.

Defense Attorneys In Pellicano Case Urge Judge To Investigate Leak To N.Y. Times Reporters (LAT)

By Greg Krikorian And Chuck Philips, Times Staff Writers

The Los Angeles Times, March 7, 2007

Lawyer says the federal government could be involved in the release of sealed evidence to N.Y. Times reporters

Nearly a year after confidential FBI documents in the wiretap and racketeering case of Anthony Pellicano were disclosed, defense attorneys have stepped up their push for a federal judge to independently investigate who leaked the evidence to the New York Times.

Times reporters David M. Halbfinger and Allison Hope Weiner used the reports to write several stories about Hollywood bigwigs, including attorney Bert Fields, former agent Michael Ovitz and others, who have not been charged in the case. Pellicano, once known as the private eye to the stars, and several of his legal and Hollywood clients are accused of eavesdropping on opponents to win advantage in courtroom battles.

The leak investigation has been handled by the U.S. attorney's office and the FBI in San Diego because prosecutors and FBI agents in Los Angeles are among those with access to the compromised evidence.

But in recent weeks, defense lawyers have urged U.S. District Judge Dale S. Fischer, who is hearing the Pellicano criminal case in Los Angeles, to intervene. Defense attorney Terree Bowers, who represents entertainment attorney Terry Christensen, one of Pellicano's co-defendants, has been particularly aggressive, accusing the government of involvement in the leaks.

In recent court papers, Bowers said the New York Times reporters told an unnamed witness that they had received the confidential information from the government before it was turned over to defense attorneys.

Bowers also asserted that lead FBI agent Stan Ornellas told another witness that he had lost some of his notes on the case. If true, Bowers argued, the missing documents could be the source of the leaks. Or Ornellas could have made up the story to set up an alibi against charges that he was the leaker.

Ornellas and prosecutors Daniel Saunders and Kevin Lally have denied responsibility for the leak. Other FBI and Justice Department officials note that anyone who worked on the career-making case for years would be loath to risk it by turning over sealed documents to journalists.

Recent court papers state that federal authorities involved in the case have executed waivers releasing Weiner and Halbfinger from any promises they might have made to remain silent about their contacts with government agents.

In their latest filing, prosecutors also made a not-so-subtle reference to the BALCO case, in which a defense attorney who had accused the government of leaking turned out to be the source for incendiary reports about steroid use by major league baseball players.

"The government notes only that recent events have demonstrated that a defense counsel's unsupported accusations of government misconduct … should be accorded little if any weight," Saunders and Lally wrote in a footnote to a 26-page motion.

The Pellicano leak investigation is not as well known as the BALCO case or the disclosure of CIA operative Valerie Plame's identity, which resulted in perjury convictions against former vice presidential aide I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby. But it has its own interesting twists, including a separate federal investigation into accusations that Weiner misidentified herself to get in to see Pellicano in prison.

Weiner was permanently barred from any federal prison facility last summer after authorities concluded that she had misrepresented herself as an attorney to see Pellicano.

Weiner, who received a USC law degree 20 years ago, is registered with the California bar but has never done legal work for Pellicano. It is against the law to enter a federal detention center under false pretenses.

Weiner told her superiors at the New York Times that she had informed several jail guards that she was a New York Times reporter. But in December, the San Diego prosecutor and two FBI agents showed prison officials and other witnesses at the detention center a form on which Weiner had written "legal" to describe the purpose of a June 14 visit, sources said.

The prosecution team also played a videotape of Weiner's entry attempt for the officials, sources close to the investigation said.

The New York Times declined to comment on the specifics of either investigation.

"We believe it is critically important for reporters to be able to protect their confidential sources of information," New York Times spokeswoman Diane McNulty said. "And [we] will continue to advocate their ability to do so."

The leak investigation is expected to be discussed at a court hearing in the Pellicano case later this month.

DOJ_NMG_0141502

*

greg.krikorian@latimes.com
chuck.philips@latimes.com

Kurtz Case, Activist Art In Limbo (PPG)

By Mary Thomas, Pittsburgh Post-gazette
Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, March 7, 2007

The legal battle with the Department of Justice that artist Steve Kurtz is embroiled in has implications not only for artists but, by extension, for anyone engaged in outside-the-box public discourse that challenges established convention.

Kurtz is a founding member of the widely acclaimed art collective Critical Art Ensemble (CAE, established in 1987), which exhibits internationally and was included in the 2006 Whitney Biennial. The group examines the impact of science and technology on consumer culture through works that are activist, performative and conceptual.

An associate professor of art at State University of New York, Buffalo, who formerly taught at Carnegie Mellon University, Kurtz lectured at The Andy Warhol Museum Saturday on "Second Wave Eugenics and Critical Art Practice," in conjunction with the exhibition "Deadly Medicine: Creating the Master Race."

With him was Lucia Sommer, a CAE member and defense committee coordinator, who later answered questions about his case, which is moving sluggishly through a series of pre-trial motions.

In May 2004, Kurtz's wife died in their Buffalo home. Police who responded to his 911 call noticed scientific materials, including petri dishes, in the house and notified the FBI, who confiscated Kurtz's computer, books and components of CAE projects under the Patriot Act.

Analysis showed that his wife died of natural causes, and that the microorganisms impounded were harmless and readily available from biological supply houses. Lacking bioterrorism evidence, the FBI charged Kurtz with mail fraud and wire fraud -- based on his alleged receipt of the bacteria from University of Pittsburgh scientist Robert Ferrell -- and each of them faces a possible 20-year sentence.

The CAE sees the case as having the precedent-setting possibility to blur the division between civil and criminal law, should the Department of Justice win.

Sommer says that it "seems almost certain" that the case will go to trial, though a date has not yet been set and lawyers estimate it could be one-and-a-half to two years away. A motion to dismiss it is among about a dozen the defense has filed during the pre-trial process.

Contesting the terms laid down by the prosecutor has slowed the case momentum, and Sommer is concerned that public interest, which she believes will be particularly important during the trial, be maintained. To that end, the CAE Defense Fund, which was established after Kurtz's arrest, has initiated a separate education fund for use at trial time.

In the year following his arrest, Sommer says, Kurtz attended 32 fund-raisers held on his behalf on several continents, to pay his $7,000 to $10,000 a month legal fees. An auction of artworks donated by prominent global artists at the Paula Cooper Gallery, New York, alone raised $167,700.

The new fund will be used to encourage an international presence in Buffalo during the trial, Sommer says, including persons to conduct consciousness-raising activities as well as expert witnesses from the disciplines of art, science and technology to attest to the worth of CAE work.

"Political trials like this are won as much in the court of public opinion as in the court of law," Sommer says.

Some who've weighed in on the arrest feel that it's the result of a cultural disjunct; that the government doesn't realize that it's commonplace, and that there is historic precedent, for artists to employ contemporary technology and scientific discoveries, not to mention social issues, in their expression. Others more cynically conclude that the government knew exactly what the collective had been up to.

If it didn't, it does now.

Among the things taken from Kurtz's house were components of the CAE work "Free Range Grain," which was to have been part of the exhibition "The Interventionists: Art in the Social Sphere" that opened later in the month at the Massachusetts Museum of Contemporary Art, North Adams. The work, which had been shown earlier in Europe, addresses genetic modification of food.

Also confiscated were elements of the CAE's most recent project "Marching Plague," described on the CAE Defense Fund Web site (caedefensefund.org.) as "dedicated to demystifying the issues surrounding germ warfare." Although none of his research materials has been returned, Kurtz managed to rewrite and publish "Marching Plague: Germ Warfare and Global Public Health." It was the companion film to this work that premiered at last year's Whitney Biennial.

DOJ_NMG_0141503

The Warhol exhibition Kurtz's lecture supplemented originated at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, D.C., and addresses the role eugenics played in the Nazi racist ideology that led to the murder of 6 million Jews. His lecture was co-sponsored by the University of Pittsburgh Schools of the Health Sciences, Center for Bioethics & Health Law, Department of the History of Art & Architecture and The Graduate Program for Cultural Studies.

Kurtz illustrated his Warhol talk with other CAE projects, including "Flesh Machine" of 1996-97, which incorporated an actual gene donor profile form to make a point about how ingrained and myopic social values are, and how they can be manipulated.

CAE, in short, provokes the kinds of questions that an informed citizenry must consider to control its destiny. One could imagine how that may interfere with the information flow delivered by a consumer marketplace fattened by complacency.

Asked if anyone else is doing the work of the CAE regarding genetic applications, Sommer answers no, certainly not on such a comprehensive scale. When weighing what to make of this "Kafkaesque," as Kurtz has dubbed it, series of events, that's a significant point to consider.

Inquiry Looks At Accusations That Wines Had False Labels (NYT)

By James Barron And Eric Asimov

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

Federal investigators in New York are looking into allegations of counterfeiting in high-end wine sales, issuing subpoenas to auction houses that handled what were billed as rare bottles with distinguished provenances, according to people in the wine trade.

Agents from the F.B.I.'s art-fraud squad have collected a large amount of data on wine sales, according to one person with direct knowledge of the investigation.

The inquiry, reported yesterday by The Wall Street Journal, is centered on whether auction houses, collectors or importers sold wines they knew could not be from the vintages listed on the labels.

A spokesman for Christie's, which sold $58.5 million worth of wine last year, more than half of it in the United States, said that they had received a subpoena. "We have been cooperating with officials and will continue to do so," Christie's said in a statement.

In 1985, Christie's accepted a consignment of what it described as the oldest authenticated-vintage Bordeaux it had ever sold, a Château Lafite dated 1787 and carried the initials "Th.J.," for Thomas Jefferson. The shipment was consigned by Hardy Rodenstock, a German music publisher and wine merchant.

William I. Koch, a billionaire wine collector, is suing Mr. Rodenstock over four bottles of the wine that he concluded could not have been Jefferson's. Mr. Rodenstock's lawyer, Birgit Kurtz, did not return a call seeking comment.

Mr. Koch said yesterday that he found 500 other bottles in his 35,000-bottle collection that he believes are fake, some traceable to Mr. Rodenstock. He said he was considering expanding his lawsuit to include those bottles and the resellers who sold them to him.

In keeping with Justice Department policy, Yusill Scribner, a spokeswoman for federal prosecutors, said she would not confirm or deny that there was an investigation.

The labeling of wine has long been a problem, but in recent years fraud has become widespread in the world of the high-end collector.

"It's a major concern over the last 10 years easily," said Tim Kopec, the wine director of Veritas, a New York restaurant known for the breadth and depth of its wine list, "and more people with large amounts of money who come into the wine world are fueling the issue."

"Once I started to see bottles of wine selling in excess of $1,000 a bottle, it really started to become a problem," Mr. Kopec added. "The first bottle I remember breaking $1,000 was the '61 Pétrus back in the early '90s. Today it's quite commonplace at the retail level, at the auction level, at restaurants. It's even common to see people spending $5,000 or $10,000 for magnums of old Pomerol or for aged Burgundies, even $15,000 or $20,000."

To protect themselves, collectors often employ consultants experienced with old wines, people like Mr. Kopec, or Robert Bohr, the wine director at Cru, another New York restaurant with a spectacular wine list.

These consultants assist them in their quest for valuable bottles, whether investigating wines to be sold at auction or evaluating the contents of a cellar or an estate. They try to trace the provenance of the wines. If a bottle's history leads directly and clearly to the producer, it may be a safer bet than a bottle with a murky history.

And they carefully inspect the bottles. "We know how clear or fuzzy the labels should be, what the font size should be, what the cork should look like," Mr. Bohr said.

DOJ_NMG_0141504

While a fraudulent bottle can sometimes be easy to spot, sometimes it can be exceedingly difficult. Today, with the extent of the problem evident, producers take steps to prevent counterfeiting, like etching the bottle with the vintage or other identifying mark. Corks are generally marked with the name of the producer and the vintage.

Counterfeiters have an easier time with older bottles. Thirty years ago frugal Burgundy producers like Henri Jayer would pay for a generic label that could be used year after year, differentiating vintages with a tag placed at the neck. The tag of a bottle from a poor vintage could easily be steamed off and replaced with one from a great vintage.

Thus, a bottle of Jayer Cros Parantoux '79, considered to be a lesser vintage in Burgundy, could easily be transformed into a Cros Parantoux from the legendary 1978 vintage, a bottle that can be found for sale on the Internet for $5,500.

"When we were buying a lot of Jayer, we sprung the cork on an '85 Échezeaux and it didn't taste like '85," Mr. Bohr said. "We looked at the cork and it was an '82."

Oftentimes, though, even experts have little more to go on than their instincts. They may sense something amiss without being able to put their finger on anything specific. "It's not like you can say, 'This is a fake,' " Mr. Kopec said. "You just get a bad vibe and you say, 'Even if this might be good, it's not worth the risk.' "

FBI Chemist Rebuts Frame-up Theory (MJS)

Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, March 7, 2007

Chilton - Prosecution witnesses on Tuesday rebutted claims that deputies planted Steven Avery's blood to frame him for the murder of Teresa Halbach.

Marc LeBeau, chief of the chemistry unit at the FBI lab in Virginia, testified Tuesday that he did testing on a vial and on three of Avery's bloodstains in Halbach's vehicle. He said the blood vial contained a chemical that prevents blood from clotting, or EDTA. But he said the stains from the vehicle did not contain the chemical.

EDTA can survive temperatures of up to 300 degrees Fahrenheit, he testified.

"It is my opinion that the bloodstains that were collected from the RAV4 could not have come from the EDTA tube that was provided to us in this case," LeBeau said.

On cross-examination by Avery attorney Jerome Buting, LeBeau admitted that the FBI created a new protocol for this case and validated it in about two weeks. He also admitted his study didn't determine how much EDTA was in the vial, and he knew of no study on the breakdown rate of EDTA in an 11-year-old vial of blood. But he said the lab could detect EDTA in a 33-month-old bloodstain.

Avery claims that his blood, stored in an unsecured vial at the Manitowoc County courthouse, was planted by investigators at the scene of the Halloween 2005 killing.

The blood in the vial was drawn in 1996 as part of the appeals process in a rape case for which Avery served 18 years in prison. DNA analysis showed he was innocent.

CIVIL RIGHTS:

Ex-jailer Teel Will Be Released By Wednesday (BSH)

By Robin Fitzgerald

Biloxi Sun Herald, March 7, 2007

GULFPORT - Former Harrison County jailer Ryan Teel, granted bond this afternoon, will be released and at home under electronic monitoring by tonight or in the morning.

U.S. Chief Magistrate Judge John M. Roper ordered his release before a packed federal courtroom. On one side, friends and family of Jessie Lee Williams Jr. responded with audible gasps. On the opposite side, Teel's mother leaned forward and patted a shoulder of Teel's wife, who wept in relief.

Teel has been in custody for more than six months since his arrest by the FBI. He has pleaded not guilty to a two-count indictment of depriving Williams' rights and obstructing justice to conceal Williams' assault in the jail booking room on Feb. 4, 2006. Williams, 40, died two days later.

Roper agreed to allow home incarceration for Teel in spite of federal trial attorney John Richmond's argument that nothing had changed in Teel's indictment. Teel's trial is set for May 28.

Teel was denied bond on Aug. 31, 2006, in an order that stated he was a flight risk and a possible danger to others in the community. Two psychological reports submitted in court on Tuesday conclude that Teel is not a danger to others, according to defense attorney Jim Davis.

DOJ_NMG_0141505

Copies of the reports obtained by the Sun Herald show neither psychologist addressed whether Teel is a flight risk. One report, from Dr. Beverly Smallwood, said Teel is suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder because of "incidents he experienced as a corrections officer."

Roper set a $250,000 unsecured bond, which doesn't have to be paid unless Teel fails to make a court appearance or violates any condition of release. The electronic monitoring will limit him to 150 feet from the monitoring device. Roper said Teel is allowed to go nowhere except court appearances or pre-approved medical visits.

He also is prohibited from having contact with any past or present jail or Sheriff's Department employee, potential witnesses or victims.

Teel's attorney requested the bond hearing, in part, on the grounds that bond was denied before the federal government decided it wouldn't seek the death penalty.

Richmond told Roper that bond shouldn't be considered on that basis because a possible death penalty was not listed as a reason for his initial denial of bond.

"The court was aware of it," Roper replied.

"God help us all," Williams' brother, Terry, later told the Sun Herald. "Pray for justice and for the right thing to happen."

Two former jailers have admitted their roles in Williams' assault. Three other ex-jailers also have pleaded guilty to conspiring to deprive inmates of their rights in a federal investigation of alleged civil-rights violations at the Harrison County jail.

Teel's trial is set for May 28. He faces a life prison sentence if convicted on the civil-rights allegation involving Williams' assault and subsequent death. Sentencings in the five plea agreements of the other ex-jailers have been placed on hold pending resolution of Teel's case. They remain free on unsecured bonds of $25,000 each.

The Sun Herald gives more coverage on this story on sunherald.com and in Wednesday's editions.

Local Man: Feds Probe Jail Beating (JOJHN)

By Joe Hosey, Staff Writer

Joliet (IL) Herald News, March 7, 2007

A Crest Hill man claiming he was brutally beaten by guards at the Will County jail says the feds have launched a probe into the incident at his request.

"I have complete faith in the U.S. Attorney's Office and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to end these types of actions before someone else is seriously hurt," local businessman Robert Darin said earlier this week.

The Herald News obtained letters sent by Darin to state Attorney General Lisa Madigan's office and the Chicago office of the U.S. attorney detailing his alleged attack at the hands of guards at the county jail.

In the letters, Darin says he was the victim of an "unprovoked severe beating by two Will County deputies" while he was waiting to bond out on a traffic charge nearly a year ago.

Robyn Ziegler, a spokeswoman for Madigan's office, would not discuss the letter or Darin's allegations.

"There's nothing public we can say about this right now," Ziegler said.

Kim Nerheim, a spokeswoman for the U.S. attorney's Chicago branch, would provide no information about the letters sent to David Glockner, the chief of the office's criminal division.

But Special Agent Ross Rice of the FBI confirmed Darin filed a complaint, but said the investigation is still in its initial stages.

"We are conducting what we call a preliminary inquiry," Rice said.

"He just alleged his civil rights were violated in the Will County jail," he said.

Darin contends this violation of his civil rights nearly cost him his life.

Darin's experience in the county jail began after a Joliet police officer ran his license after pulling him over for improper lane usage in April. The officer -- and Darin -- discovered he was wanted in Grundy Country for a misdemeanor warrant and that his license was suspended.

Darin says in his letter that "the misdemeanor charge arose out of a misunderstanding pertaining to a bill for services to an animal that I rescued. The day after I was released from custody, I met with the Grundy County state's attorney and the charge was dismissed. As for my license, it turns out that it was suspended for an emission violation on a vehicle that I no longer owned."

Darin said Joliet police gave him the option of posting $100 cash for his release from the station, but he did not have the money on him and was taken to the county jail where he would be able to use his credit card to make bond.

"While at the Will County Adult Detention Facility, a deputy apparently said something to me which I did not hear because I am deaf in one ear," Darin wrote in his letter. "I was then taken into a cell where I was severely beaten; I was kicked in the face, ribs and legs over 30 times. I sustained a laceration above my right eye requiring 10 stitches; I also sustained an uptake

(fracture) in the right and left lower anterior rib cage. I also had problems associated with a collapsed lung and severe pains in the thoracic region."

Nearly five hours after he was taken into custody, Darin called the office of his attorney, Chuck Bretz.

"My attorneys immediately called the detention facility and asked that I be released and that I receive medical attention," Darin wrote in the letters. "They were also informed that there was videotape of the holding area and the video of the incident would be reviewed."

Darin was charged with obstructing a peace officer in connection with the incident at the jail. This charge later was dropped.

Darin received hospital treatment the day he was released from jail and returned to the emergency room the following day for additional care.

In the subsequent hearings on the obstruction charge, Darin's attorneys subpoenaed videos of the incident in the jail. The tape eventually was provided by State's Attorney James Glasgow's office, Darin says in his letter, and, "It was later determined by an expert I retained that the video that was tendered was intentionally altered and had been manipulated to exclude the footage of the beating that I had received."

The expert was to review the jail's surveillance system, Darin says in his letter, but prosecutors dropped the charges without allowing him to do so.

"A comment was made that the full videotape was no longer available," he wrote in his letter. "I believe they stalled the court proceedings for that purpose."

Bretz, one of Darin's attorneys, was similarly chagrined.

"We were disappointed in the failure to provide a prompt response to our request for the video footage," Bretz said last week. "At this point, we are working with Mr. Darin to explore his options as far as legal action against the specific deputies involved and the county. If there is anyone who has information pertaining to Mr. Darin's incident, or any similar incidents which have occurred in the Will County Adult Detention Facility, we would appreciate if those persons would contact either myself or (attorney) Cosmo Tedone."

Glasgow's spokesman, Charles B. Pelkie, declined to comment on the allegations contained in the letters. Likewise, sheriff's department spokesman Pat Barry declined to comment.

Darin, who is in the real estate business, also volunteers as a state-licensed investigator of animal crimes and has had prior contact with Glasgow's office. He says he thought prosecutors would be more responsive to his request that they probe his alleged beating.

"They (prosecutors) have contacted me over a dozen times concerning several ongoing animal abuse cases, but not once have they questioned me about this incident," Darin said.

Rice said the bureau would forward the findings of its investigation to the U.S. Attorney's Office, and from there it would go to the Department of Justice in Washington, D.C.

Contact Joe Hosey at (815) 729-6054 or e-mail him at jhosey@scn1.com

US Hate Crimes Being Prosecuted After Half A Century (AFP)

AFP, March 7, 2007

The US government is probing hundreds of unsolved hate crimes committed during its tumultuous civil rights movement era, hoping to try at least a dozen suspects who escaped justice for half a century.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) urged its bureaus last year to reopen botched cases from the 1950s and 1960s, and apply modern forensic techniques to try to uncover new evidence and possible witnesses.

Their analysis produced tangible results in hundreds of lynchings and murders allegedly committed by white supremacists, but only a dozen prosecutions are likely to be pursued.

"In too many instances, the truth has been hidden for too long," FBI director Robert Mueller said at a recent press conference.

Many of the killers are deceased, witnesses have disappeared, several of the crimes were committed too long ago to prosecute under existing statutes, or local attorneys refused to cede jurisdiction to federal prosecutors.

"Many individuals have, quite literally, gotten away with murder. We cannot turn back the clock. We cannot right these wrongs. But we can try to bring a measure of justice to those who remain," Mueller said.

"To those individuals who committed these crimes, who have lived with their guilty consciences for these many years, our message should be clear: You have not gotten away with anything. We are still on your trail," added US Attorney General Alberto Gonzales.

DOJ_NMG_0141507

In late January, authorities caught up with former Ku Klux Klan (KKK) member, James Seale, 71, suspected of beating two young black men to death 42 years ago because one of them was a civil rights activist.

Accused of kidnapping, he faces possible life in prison.

Thanks to continued pressure by civil rights groups and victims' families for action, several criminal trials were launched since the late 1980s in southern states, resulting in convictions of two dozen former KKK members who had made little effort to hide their crimes.

Among the old fossils who generally expressed no regret, Edgar Ray, 80, was convicted in June 2005 of murdering three young activists in 1964, a crime that shocked the nation and inspired Alan Parker's 1988 film "Mississippi Burning."

Most of the witnesses in the case had died long ago, so the jury relied on their posthumous accounts of Ray's crime.

Two weeks ago, however, another jury refused to consider similar testimony in the assassination of Emmett Till, a black adolescent killed in August 1955 in the Mississippi delta after he had whistled at a young Caucasian woman who crossed his path.

The woman's husband and brother-in-law, acquitted soon afterwards by an all-white jury, later described what they had done in great detail to a journalist, convinced that their actions were not criminal.

In 2004, the government re-opened the case, exhumed the adolescents remains to search for new evidence. The two murderers were deceased, so prosecutors accused the woman of inciting her husband to kill the boy who allegedly had shown her a lack of respect.

Federal authorities, however, were forced to hand over the investigation to local officials and a local jury refused to indict the woman for lack of evidence.

Council Offers 2 Maps For Hearing (FAYOBS)

By Don Worthington, Staff writer

The Fayetteville Observer, March 7, 2007

Residents will get their say March 29 on the boundaries for six election districts.

Residents attending a March 29 public hearing on Fayetteville's new election districts will get to choose between two plans — or they can bring their own.

The council voted Tuesday to take two maps to the public after failing to choose one map.

Also on the agenda will be a public hearing on whether the mayor should have a vote under the 6-3 format approved by voters Feb. 6.

Six council members would be elected from districts and three elected citywide. When the city previously used that format, the mayor voted only to break ties.

The 6-3 council format and maps will be submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice for review under the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Any changes to Fayetteville's election practices cannot dilute minority voting.

The Department of Justice could approve the changes, approve the format but ask for a different map, or decide the 6-3 format is a step backward.

The city hired Michael Crowell, a lawyer with redistricting experience, to draw the new election districts. Tuesday was the third public meeting the council has held with Crowell.

The most asked question was which map would be approved by the Department of Justice.

Crowell sidestepped the question, noting that each might pass. He said that one version, labeled "G," had a better balance of whites to blacks in the districts than the map labeled "C-1." He said if the council voted for C-1 it should list why that map is a better alternative than G.

All of the maps Crowell has presented to the council will become part of the city's submission to the Department of Justice.

Under Department of Justice guidelines, the city should have three districts where minorities are the majority.

Black council member Curtis Worthy and Mayor Pro Tem Robert Massey questioned Crowell about the percentages of whites and blacks in the various districts.

Under the current nine single-member districts, the black majority is as high as 65percent in some districts.

Crowell said the percentage of blacks in the current districts is higher than it needs to be. The result reduces minority voting influence in other areas of the city, he said.

Under Crowell's maps, the highest minority percentage would be 55 percent.

In previous meetings, the council looked at possible maps showing where incumbents live.

The district that Councilman D.J. Haire would be assigned to has generated some controversy. Haire lives on Seabrook Road, but he lists a Filter Plant Road address as a point of contact on the City Council's Web site.

DOJ_NMG_0141508

Map G would place Haire in a district by himself and put Massey, Charles Evans and Keith Bates in the same district. Map C-1 would place Massey, Bates and Haire in the same district.

Both maps put incumbents Lois Kirby, Wesley Meredith and Paul Williams in the same district. In both cases, there is no incumbent living in District 5, the annexed neighborhoods south of Raeford Road.

Residences of incumbents were not shown on the maps reviewed Tuesday.

The maps attempt to keep neighborhoods and precincts intact. The biggest difference between the two maps is the boundaries of District 1, District 2 and District 4.

Under map G, District 1 extends from north Fayetteville along Ramsey Street to downtown and then across the Cape Fear River. Under map C-1, District 1 stops at Rowan Street. District 2 is extended eastward to include downtown. District 4, which includes Haymount, VanStory and the Bordeaux areas, is stretched to include areas east of the Cape Fear River.

City Council comment was kept to a minimum Tuesday.

Williams, who did not attend earlier meetings on redistricting, said the assumption behind drawing the maps sickened him.

"The assumption is whites won't vote for blacks. It's sad we are still in these days," he said.

Staff writer Don Worthington can be reached at worthingtond@fayobserver.com or 486-3511.

Oxford Annexation OK'd By Justice Dept. (AP)

AP, March 7, 2007

OXFORD — The Justice Department has informed Oxford officials that it has approved the city's annexation proposal that adds 4.3 square miles and some 5,000 new residents.

The annexation expands the city's area from 12.2 square miles to 16.5 square miles and the population from 14,000 to 19,000.

Officials said city ordinances took effect immediately, but full enforcement will take time.

"Everyone knows all this change won't occur overnight," Mayor Richard Howorth said Monday.

Bill Expands Hate Crimes To Homeless (WT/AP)

By Kristen Wyatt

The Washington Times, March 7, 2007

ANNAPOLIS -- The state Senate adopted a first-in-the-nation hate crime classification for homeless people yesterday, despite concern that the measure would dilute hate-crime protections.

Under the bill, homeless people would join ethnic and racial minorities as protected classes in Maryland hate-crimes laws. Sexual orientation and religion are also included.

A Senate committee considering the bill watched videos of homeless people being beating before adopting the idea.

"Some people beat up on the homeless for sport," said Sen. Lisa A. Gladden, Baltimore Democrat.

Homeless advocates praised the passage of the bill, which now heads to the House.

"This is a growing problem," said Jessica Schuler, a policy analyst for the Washington-based National Coalition for the Homeless. "These crimes are occurring out of the same ignorance other hate crimes come out of."

However, the bill sparked a sharp debate and brought opponents from both parties. Most of the sponsors of the bill are Republicans, and some worried the bill was an attempt to water down hate-crimes laws. The Senate defeated attempts to add disabled people and "economic class" to the bill.

"I believe every crime is a hate crime," said Sen. E.J. Pipkin, Eastern Shore Republican, who voted against the measure. "It begins to undermine why we have a special class for hate crimes."

Miss Gladden said, "We should get to a point in America where we don't need hate crimes and special classes. But we're not there yet."

Other Democrats worried the action would open up more proposals to expand hate crimes laws until they mean little.

"I'm not confident it was well thought out," said Sen. Edward J. Kasemeyer, Baltimore /Howard Democrat who voted against the bill.

Senate President Thomas V. Mike Miller Jr., a Democrat, ultimately voted for the bill but acknowledged the delicate nature of its contents.

Racial Tensions Are Simmering In Hawaii's Melting Pot (USAT)

By Martin Kasindorf

USA Today, March 7, 2007

DOJ_NMG_0141509

HONOLULU — A violent road-rage altercation between Native Hawaiians and a white couple near Pearl Harbor two weeks ago is provoking questions about whether Hawaii's harmonious "aloha spirit" is real or just a greeting for tourists.

The Feb. 19 attack, in which a Hawaiian father and son were arrested and charged with beating a soldier and his wife unconscious, was unusual here for its brutality. It sparked a public debate over race relations that is filling blogs and newspaper websites with impassioned comments along stark ethnic lines.

These divisive exchanges come as the U.S. Supreme Court and Congress are being asked to tackle another inflammatory racial issue in a state where no race is a majority: special benefits for Native Hawaiians, ranging from preference at an elite private school to free houses on government land. One side says the long-established perks compensate Hawaiians for past wrongs and preserve their valuable culture for the islands. The other side says the benefits discriminate against other racial groups.

The current controversies are exposing racial tensions below the surface of a tropical paradise that Gov. Linda Lingle says is "a model for the world" in diversity and peaceful integration. Simmering divisions pit Hawaiians against other groups, and "locals" of all races against newcomers including immigrants and military members.

At issue now is whether Hawaii will acknowledge and overcome these threats to its friendly reputation.

Last month's road-rage incident began when an SUV driven by Army Staff Sgt. Andrew Dussell, 26, who has served two tours in Iraq, struck the parked car of Gerald Paakaula, 44, at a shopping center, according to a police affidavit filed in court. Paakaula and his 16-year-old son allegedly assaulted Dussell and his wife, Dawn, 23.

The teenager allegedly shouted an obscenity along with the Hawaiian term for a white person, haole (pronounced "howl-ee"), while attacking the soldier.

The court document says the father, a truck driver, picked up the woman and slammed her to the asphalt. The teenager allegedly kicked the husband's face as he convulsed on the ground from a punch to the throat. The couple suffered broken noses, facial fractures and concussions.

In another incident Jan. 27, nine white campers in a beach park on the Big Island of Hawaii were beaten by men in their 20s who told the campers to leave the island, the police report says. Hawaii County Police Maj. John Dawrs describes the assailants as "Pacific Islanders."

Racial troubles in the islands usually don't get much public discussion. In a tourism-dependent state, talk about tensions is "like news about shark attacks," says Jon Van Dyke, a University of Hawaii law professor. "People are afraid they might lose customers."

Now, people are speaking out. Honolulu Prosecuting Attorney Peter Carlisle says he's getting public pressure to add a "hate crime" charge to the felony assault charge against Paakaula. The maximum sentence for assault is five years, but that would double to 10 years if the defendant is convicted of a hate crime. Carlisle says this case doesn't fit Hawaii's hate-crime law requiring intentional "selection" of a victim because of ethnicity, gender or sexual orientation.

Hawaii recorded six hate crimes last year, up from one or two in each previous year since recordkeeping began in 2003, according to the state.

"There is a notion that we have this kind of rainbow society and we all get along really swell," says Jon Matsuoka, dean of the university's School of Social Work. "The reality is that there are racial tensions. They are deep-seated and historical, and that history didn't abruptly stop."

Hawaii, annexed by the United States as a territory in 1898 and a state since 1959, promotes a picture of aloha. Hawaiians have lavished this "love" greeting on visitors since the first missionaries came from New England in 1820. "In the host culture, tolerance is paramount," says former governor Ben Cayetano, a Democrat. "That is the greatness of Hawaii."

By many measures, Hawaii is a paragon of racial accord. One in two marriages are across ethnic lines, says Lingle, a Missouri-born haole. Most neighborhoods are integrated. In a 2005 Census survey, 21% of residents listed themselves as being of more than one race — the highest percentage of any state.

Hawaii's governors have included Caucasians, the Japanese-American George Ariyoshi, the Native Hawaiian John Waihee and the Filipino-American Cayetano. Honolulu Mayor Mufi Hannemann is Samoan-German. The state's five-member Supreme Court includes a Filipino, a Japanese-American and a Korean-American.

One irritant in this tolerant atmosphere is a string of federal civil rights lawsuits filed since 1996, alleging that special rights for Native Hawaiians illegally discriminate against non-Hawaiians.

Lawyers petitioned the Supreme Court last week to order the private Kamehameha Schools to admit a white student. The school trustees accept few non-Hawaiians, saying they are honoring the will of the Hawaiian princess who established the school in 1883 with an endowment now worth $7.7 billion.

DOJ_NMG_0141510

The attack on the Dussells could be "a random, isolated act," Matsuoka says, "but on the other hand there have been all these encroachments on Hawaiian entitlements. I've thought for a long time that there would be growing anger and frustration on the part of the Hawaiian populace."

An estimated 246,000 Native Hawaiians live in the islands, 20% of the state's population, according to a Census survey last year. Another 140,000 live in mainland states. All but about 10,000 are of mixed races, state surveys indicate.

Hawaiians are consistently on the bottom rungs statewide in income and school test scores. At Waianae on Oahu's Leeward shore, dozens of homeless Hawaiian families camp in tents on the beach.

Census studies show Native Hawaiian numbers are slowly shrinking. The islands' low-paying service jobs in tourism and the high cost of living — 27% above the national average — have driven so many to migrate to casino jobs in Las Vegas that Hawaiians now call the Nevada city "the ninth island," says Ronald Becker, chairman of the criminal justice program at Honolulu's Chaminade University.

"If all the Native Hawaiians leave, will there be any Hawaii left?" says Dave Young of the state Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism. "That's what people come here for — the Hawaiian culture."

The court battles over Native Hawaiians' status are stirring emotion. When the phone rings at the home of lawyer John Goemans on the Big Island, he picks up the call in Beverly Hills. He quietly moved a year ago, saying he fears for his safety in Hawaii. He won a federal appeals court ruling in 2005 that struck down the Kamehameha Schools' Hawaiian-preference policy.

In protest, 15,000 marchers rallied at Iolani Palace, seat of the Hawaiian kingdom that white sugar planters overthrew in 1893 with help from U.S. Marines. Signs at the rally said "Hawaiians only" and "stop stealing from Hawaiians." Lingle, the Republican governor, spoke in support of the rights of Native Hawaiians.

"Well, 15,000 people marching — and I'm the guy they're looking for — is alarming," Goemans says, explaining his flight. "Hawaiians are wonderful people, but there are some extreme firebrands." The appeals court reheard the case and reversed its ruling in December. Now, Goemans is asking the Supreme Court to review the case.

"Don't they understand the pain that they're putting everybody through?" says Dee Jay Mailer, CEO of the Kamehameha Schools, an academic powerhouse.

"It's really less about an admissions policy than about the loss of one of the last treasures of the Hawaiian people," Mailer says.

Haunani Apoliona, chairwoman of the state Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA), says sympathy for her people is widespread.

Jeanne Larsen, 56, a hotel sous-chef who moved here from Tahiti in 1975, says: "We feel sad for them because of what was done to them years ago."

To compensate for the U.S. role in the royal overthrow, Congress in 1920 authorized free houses for 99 years to people who can prove they have at least 50% Hawaiian blood. The state manages the program on 200,000 acres of government land; 8,000 families occupy houses, with 20,000 on a waiting list. The state created OHA in 1978 to run other exclusive benefit programs.

Sen. Daniel Akaka, D-Hawaii, who is of Hawaiian and Chinese ancestry, spearheaded through Congress a 1993 resolution declaring the overthrow illegal and apologizing to Hawaiians for the U.S. role in the coup. President Clinton signed the apology.

Hawaiians are having mixed success defending their privileges. In 2000, the Supreme Court ruled that Hawaii had set up an illegal "racial classification" when it limited elections for OHA trustees to Native Hawaiian voters. A lawsuit brought by a taxpayer group attacking OHA and the home-lease program soon will be dismissed on procedural grounds, but similar suits are sure to be filed, state Attorney General Mark Bennett says.

If Hawaiians lose their favored status in the courts, they could regain it in Congress. Akaka filed a Senate bill that would allow Hawaiians to form a separate government like those of American Indian tribes.

Federal recognition of such an entity would put Hawaiians in a position to keep their perks and demand more.

Last June, a Republican filibuster stopped the controversial Akaka bill from reaching the Senate floor for a vote. Akaka reintroduced it in January. "With a Democratic majority, the prospects are better in this Congress," says Akaka, 82.

Hawaiians are split over how to improve their group's status. Sandra Puanani Burgess, 55, the part-Hawaiian co-founder of the group Aloha for All, says Hawaiians should have no special rights.

The most radical want to secede from the United States. Ikaika Hussey, 28, of Hui Pu ("to unite"), a group opposing the Akaka bill, says it fails to offer "the option of independence."

Some Hawaiians say independence is desirable but impracticable. "Secede? Oh, God, we would love to," says Haunani-Kay Trask, 57, a Hawaiian studies professor at the University of Hawaii. "As a nationalist, I hate the United States of America. But (independence) doesn't live in the political-military world we live in, with 26 military bases in Hawaii and 7 million tourists a year."

DOJ_NMG_0141511

Booming tourism is bringing some new social stresses. Hawaii's unemployment rate was 2% in December, the USA's lowest. The hot economy is attracting poorly educated immigrants who can have problems fitting in. Groups of young Micronesians from Western Pacific islands such as Chuk sometimes fight with other groups in low-income Honolulu neighborhoods, police reports say.

Public schools hire Frank De Lima, a popular local comedian who specializes in ethnic jokes, to warn kids that slang racial descriptions can be explosive insults to immigrants or children whose parents are in the military.

Some in Hawaii's 24.9% minority of whites say they sense discrimination.

David Bell, 50, a Honolulu teacher, is white and Canadian Indian. Even after 26 years here, he says, he feels snubbed for looking white. "There's not that much acceptance," he says. "It bothered me, but after a while you learn to deal with it. You have to earn their acceptance."

Karen Knudsen, chairwoman of the state Board of Education, says, "You will hear people say 'dumb haole,' and it's not a big deal. But you would never say 'dumb' any other group. That's considered offensive."

Military personnel say they can feel like outsiders. "At our first-day briefing, we are told to avoid certain places after dark," says Army Pfc. Jennifer Olsen, 29, of Redding, Calif., based at Oahu's Schofield Barracks.

"Sometimes, being white, we go to a store and some people are first more willing to help their own. They're very much against the military people being here. I don't understand it."

For all the problems, Hawaii is a safe place. Rates of murder and other violent crimes are low, prosecutor Carlisle says.

"The race thing isn't perfect here," he adds. "But there is a lot that people can learn about race relationships from Hawaii."

ACLU Sues Over Migrant Children At Former Jail In Texas (LAT)

By Lianne Hart, Times Staff Writer

The Los Angeles Times, March 7, 2007

The group says they are living in substandard conditions. A federal spokesman says the facility is designed humanely.

HOUSTON — Children are being illegally detained at a converted Texas prison while they wait for their parents' immigration appeals to be heard, the American Civil Liberties Union charged in lawsuits filed Tuesday.

The suits allege that the immigrant children being held at the T. Don Hutto detention center in Taylor, Texas, are living in substandard conditions and should be released under supervision to religious groups or charities.

"There is simply no justification for imprisoning innocent children who pose no threat to anyone," said Vanita Gupta, a staff attorney with the ACLU's Racial Justice Program.

A spokeswoman for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement declined to comment on the lawsuit but said in a statement that the facility was "modern" and "designed to humanely accommodate families with children who are detained as a result of ICE enforcing the immigration laws of the United States."

The Hutto center holds 400 people — half of them children. Built as a so-called family residential center, it was the Bush administration's solution to keeping families together while their immigration status was under review. Corrections Corp. of America — the nation's largest private prison firm — operates the 512-bed former state prison.

Immigrant rights groups have staged protests at the Hutto center for months, objecting to its jail-like conditions and long lines for medical care.

But the suits filed Tuesday focus on 10 children living there. In the filings, the ACLU alleges that for 11 to 12 hours a day, children are kept in small cells where toys are not allowed. A light is on at all times. The children must wear government-issued garments and are sometimes disciplined by guards who threaten to permanently separate them from their parents.

ICE is working with the Women's Commission for Refugee Women and Children and Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Services, among other private organizations, to "identify family-specific detention standards," according to the statement.

The Justice Department signed off on a 1997 settlement agreement that established minimum standards for the care of minors in federal custody, according to the lawsuit. One provision called for the "least restrictive setting possible" for detained children.

"That's not happening at Hutto," Gupta said. "We're not questioning ICE's right to enforce immigration law. But why are they resorting to draconian methods when more humane alternatives are available?"

lianne.hart@latimes.com

ANTITRUST:

F.C.C. Chief Questioning Radio Deal (NYT)

DOJ_NMG_0141512

By Stephen Labaton

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON, March 6 — Kevin J. Martin, the chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, has privately questioned recent Congressional testimony by the architect of a proposed merger of the nation's two satellite radio companies that subscribers would both pay the same monthly rate and receive significantly more programming.

As he sought to sell the proposed merger of Sirius Satellite Radio and XM Satellite Radio to Congress, and by extension to regulators like Mr. Martin, Mel Karmazin, the chief executive of Sirius, vowed last Wednesday that prices would not be raised and that listeners would benefit enormously by getting the best programming from both companies.

But in separate conversations with two people after Mr. Karmazin's testimony to a House committee, Mr. Martin said that subscribers may be surprised to learn they may actually have to pay more than the current monthly rate of $12.95 if, for example, they want to receive all the games of Major League Baseball (now available only on XM) as well as all the professional football games (now only on Sirius).

Mr. Karmazin, reached on Tuesday, said his testimony was not misleading and that he meant to say two things: subscribers wanting to keep their existing service would not face a price increase, and listeners who wanted the best of both services would pay less than the combined rate of $25.90.

Mr. Martin, in an interview on Tuesday, suggested that the details had not been clear from the testimony. He emphasized that he was not questioning the motives or candor of Mr. Karmazin but that there was "a need for greater clarity" over what was being proposed for fees and programming.

"The commission will need to determine the benefits to consumers of this deal, and in doing that, we will need to carefully look at what price will be frozen and what consumers will be getting for that price," Mr. Martin said, adding that the hearing left those issues unclear. "When they talk about freezing rates and lowering rates, are they talking about it in terms of the current rate of $12.95 for each service, or are they referring to the combined rate of $25.90?"

The two people who talked to Mr. Martin — one working to get the deal done and the other a critic — said they understood his comments to reflect his skepticism about both the deal and the way it was being sold in Washington as more beneficial to consumers than it might actually be. The two did not want to be identified because they said these were private conversations.

Mr. Martin said that the proposed deal had "not even been filed with the commission yet," and that he would carefully consider the arguments of both the supporters and the opponents before reaching a decision.

The $13 billion proposed deal cannot be completed without the permission of antitrust lawyers at the Justice Department and a majority of the five commissioners at the F.C.C.

The commission gave the two companies spectrum licenses for the satellite radio services in the 1990s on the condition that they not merge, and it would have to waive that condition for the deal to go forward.

Mr. Martin has said that the companies have a high hurdle to conquer in persuading the commission that the deal would be in the public interest.

At last week's hearing before the antitrust task force of the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. Karmazin insisted that subscribers could count on a significantly greater offering of programs and no increase in prices. That juxtaposition led some lawmakers to conclude that consumers who pay the same monthly fee for one service would be getting the benefits of the other.

"This merger will give people more choice than they have before and lower prices and, very importantly, less confusion," Mr. Karmazin testified. "Our vision of the way it works is that if you are an XM subscriber, you have the Major League Baseball, you have whatever number of channels available to you now. But what we contemplate is that we would take some other content, and again we have to work with our content partners. But the hope would be that we would get Nascar to agree to be on XM as well. We'll get the N.F.L. to agree to be on XM as well."

At another point in the hearing, he said, "We are saying we are not going to raise our price, and we're going to offer the consumer something that they have not had before."

Critics said that the companies had not been candid about their intentions to offer more services for more than $12.95.

"It's a sleight of hand going on here," said Gene Kimmelman, vice president for federal affairs at Consumers Union, which opposes the merger. "They highlight the price freeze for the old package. They're leaving the consumer with the impression of a price freeze. They say you will get the best of both services. But they never tell you what the rate will be for that.

"Regardless of what Mr. Karmazin intended," Mr. Kimmelman went on, "he has left many consumers with the impression they will receive a combined package of Sirius and XM channels for $12.95, when in reality the price will probably be much higher."

Mr. Karmazin is scheduled to appear before a second Congressional panel on Wednesday.

In the interview on Tuesday afternoon, he said he thought he had been clear that to get the best of both XM and Sirius, consumers would have to pay more than the monthly rate of $12.95, but less than the combined rate of $25.90. Consumers who just want to stay with their existing lineup would be guaranteed the same price, he said.

"If the merger is approved there will be lower prices and more choice," Mr. Karmazin said. "If the merger is not approved, there is no discussion on price and there is no discussion about more choices."

Ashcroft Group Defends Contacting Opposing Sides (HILL)

By Ian Swanson

The Hill, March 7, 2007

The Ashcroft Group's decision to lobby both sides in the merger between the country's only two satellite-radio companies is nothing unusual, lobbyists unconnected to the issue said this week.

They described the Ashcroft Group's decision to contact XM Satellite Radio and the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB), which opposes the merger, to see if either was interested in hiring the former attorney general is a standard business practice in the world of Washington lobbying.

"People do it every day," one of these lobbyists, who asked to speak anonymously, said. "You see a merger going on, and you contact both sides."

XM Satellite Radio, which spurned Ashcroft's advances, publicly has criticized the Ashcroft Group and said it raises questions about the Ashcroft Group's credibility on the issue. "It looks like he was prepared to be for the merger until he was against it," a spokesman for XM, Nathaniel Brown, said.

A lobbyist looking in from the outside, however, described the move as one other lobbying firms, along with law firms and investment banks, also would make unless they had a commitment or a historic relationship with one of the parties. "The real deal is, they went after business and they went after the one that went ahead," he said.

A second lobbying source contrasted a lobbying firm that approaches two sides in a business deal about representation with a lobbying firm that historically has taken a certain philosophic side on a policy issue.

"I think there are two types of lobbyists here," the source said of Washington, "those invested with an issue who are on one side, and those who say they can open doors and … don't care about the substance."

In the case of the XM merger with Sirius Satellite Radio, it is fair game for Ashcroft to try to sell his services, the source said.

A spokeswoman for Ashcroft, Juliana Glover Weiss, explained how the Ashcroft Group went from contacting XM about representing it in the merger announced on Feb. 19 to publicly opposing the deal a little more than a week later.

The Ashcroft Group's representative in charge of bringing in new business had friends at the NAB and XM, and contacted both within five minutes, asking them if they believed their team was "strong enough" for the upcoming fight in Washington, according to Glover Weiss.

"We had a very good idea where we would be most useful within two and a half hours," she said.

She described this as a standard practice of the Ashcroft Group, which typically is in contact with several potential clients when a major corporate announcement is made. If XM and the Ashcroft Group had reached a mutual agreement to work together, Glover Weiss said the group hypothetically would have been able to "pick up the pieces" if the deal had fallen apart. Another lobbyist put it differently, saying the Ashcroft group would have done what other lobbying firms hired by Sirius and XM will now try to do: Put the deal together in a way that will pass regulatory muster.

After NAB retained the services of the Ashcroft Group, Ashcroft sent a letter to his successor, Attorney General Alberto Gonzales, criticizing the deal as raising serious competitive concerns.

Both the Department of Justice and the Federal Communications Commission must sign on to the deal before it may be approved. Congress has no direct role to play, although sources said lobbyists on both sides of the issue will be active in pushing members to take public positions on the deal, which is likely to turn on how the administration defines the market of satellite radio.

If the market includes satellite and terrestrial radio as well as other devices, such as iPods, that play music, the government might allow the merger to go forward, sources said. If they determine the satellite-radio market consists of the two companies offering satellite-radio services, they are unlikely to give the merger the go-ahead.

"Our examination of this deal will consider whether emerging technologies such as the iPod and Internet radio are competitors to satellite radio, or whether it represents a merger to monopoly which will injure customers," Sen. Herb Kohl (D-Wis.) said in a statement shortly after the merger. Kohl has signaled that his Senate Judiciary subcommittee on antitrust, competition policy and consumer rights will hold a hearing on the subject.

DOJ_NMG_0141514

The House Energy and Commerce subcommittee on telecommunications is set to hold a hearing on the merger today. This follows last week's hearing by a antitrust task force set up by House Judiciary Committee Chairman John Conyers Jr. (D-Mich.).

Union: Weirton Steel No Longer For Sale (PTR)

By C.M. Mortimer, TRIBUNE-REVIEW

Pittsburgh Tribune-Review, March 6, 2007

Weirton Steel will remain a component of Mittal Steel USA, and is no longer for sale, the leader of the Independent Steelworkers Union, which represents 1,250 members at the West Virginia plant, said Tuesday.

Mittal Steel also wants to make Weirton the "premiere" producer of tinplate in the United States, said Mark Glyptis, president of the Independent Steelworkers Union. He said union leaders were encouraged and optimistic following a meeting with senior Mittal USA officials in Chicago on Monday.

Glyptis said in a statement today that the Weirton steel operations will remain "status quo," with a mutual agreement to look for ways to improve the performance of the steel mill.

"The future of Weirton is in the hands of the employees ... and we are prepared to lead the way in making Weirton a stronger partner with the Mittal corporation," Glyptis said. "Weirton is no longer for sale. We will remain part of Mittal Steel USA," he said.

Last month, the U.S. Department of Justice said Mittal Steel must sell its Sparrows Point tin mill plant near Baltimore, instead of the Weirton mill to settle antitrust issues over the pending merger with Arcelor SA. The decision clouded the fate of the former Weirton Steel Corp.

The government said selling the mill near Baltimore was the best way to prevent a monopoly in the eastern U.S. market for tin-plated steel.

In January, Esmark Inc., a Chicago-based steel services company, signed a letter-of-intent with Mittal to buy parts of Weirton Steel, particularly its finishing facilities. The government's decision caused Mittal and Esmark to back off those plans.

The independent union at Weirton wanted their mill to be sold, instead of Sparrows Point, saying that it hadfailed to thrive under Mittal's ownership.

C.M. Mortimer can be reached at cmortimer@tribweb.com or (724) 836-5252.

Mittal, W.Va. Mill Reshape Relationship (AP)

By Vicki Smith, Associated Press Writer

AP, March 7, 2007

MORGANTOWN, W.Va. --Two weeks after learning Mittal Steel Co. would not sell its West Virginia mill, the Independent Steelworkers Union is feeling "part of the family" again, President Mark Glyptis said Tuesday.

Glyptis and other union leaders met Monday with Mittal officials in Chicago to discuss the fate of the former Weirton Steel, and left feeling encouraged.

"We walked away feeling much more part of the family," Glyptis said.

The U.S. Department of Justice initially ordered Netherlands-based Mittal to try to sell Dofasco Inc. of Canada to settle antitrust issues surrounding its merger with Luxembourg's Arcelor SA. But the Dutch trust that controls Dofasco rejected a plan to sell it to ThyssenKrupp AG of Germany.

That left Mittal with the prospect of selling one of its two U.S. assets in the tin market, Sparrows Point or Weirton.

Weirton workers, who had failed to flourish under Mittal's ownership, were disappointed by the government's decision that Sparrows Point be sold. But Justice officials said that was the best way to prevent a monopoly on the eastern U.S. market for tin-plated steel.

Since then, Glyptis said, Mittal has taken a fresh look at Weirton and been "willing to listen" to the union's ideas.

"But we have to translate ideas into results," he said.

Mittal has committed to maintaining the current operations at Weirton and making it the premier producer of tinplate in the United States, Glyptis said. The union, in turn, will have to improve the mill's performance.

"There are goals -- goals that are being refined," he said. "They've committed to giving us the resources to achieve those goals, and I think that's all positive."

Those resources may be more than monetary, Glyptis said. They could include tapping into Mittal's global expertise to improve Weirton's operations.

DOJ_NMG_0141515

After years of deep losses, Weirton Steel filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy in May 2003 and was sold twice in 18 months, first to International Steel Group, then to Mittal. Almost immediately, Mittal shut down the blast furnace, stopping the production of raw steel and cutting more than 800 jobs.

With a sale now off the table, Glyptis said he will try to refocus his 1,250 members on remaining part of Mittal for the long haul. Two membership meetings are planned for Wednesday.

Microsoft Attacks Google Over Book Search (WP)

By Alan Sipress

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

Microsoft launched an unusually caustic public broadside yesterday against Google, accusing its archrival of running roughshod over copyrights as it creates an online service for searching books.

Speaking at the annual meeting of the American Association of Publishers in New York, Thomas C. Rubin, Microsoft's associate general counsel, devoted much of his remarks to an attack on Google's practice of copying entire books into its database, often without the permission of copyright holders.

"It systematically violates copyright and deprives authors and publishers of an important avenue for monetizing their works," Rubin said, according to prepared remarks. "In doing so, it undermines critical incentives to create."

Microsoft's salvo came as the software giant faces mounting pressure from Google, which is increasingly extending its reach beyond the Web search that made it the darling of the technology industry.

Last month, Google began selling an online productivity suite, including e-mail, calendar and Web services, that competes with Microsoft's Office software. Google also continues to extend its substantial lead over Microsoft in Web searching, an area where Microsoft has struggled and that remains the main way users navigate the Internet.

Whitney Burk, a Microsoft spokesman, said Rubin decided to offer his blunt critique because he felt it was time to begin engaging publishers in the debate over how to move book content to the Web. Like Google, Microsoft is developing a database of digitized books.

"Google takes the position that everything may be freely copied unless the copyright owner notifies Google and tells it to stop," Rubin said. "Microsoft and most other companies, by contrast, take the position that they should get the copyright owner's consent before they copy."

His remarks found a sympathetic audience in the publishers association, which has filed a federal lawsuit against Google for allegedly infringing copyright laws by scanning millions of books for online searching. Google typically displays short snippets of the publications in its book-search results.

Rubin accused Google of demonstrating a "similar cavalier approach to copyright" in its management of YouTube, the online video site it bought last year. He said Google had refused to address the complaints of broadcasters, movie studios and record companies that YouTube engages in piracy by featuring copyrighted material. He further alleged that Google was earning money by featuring advertisements linked to online searches for pirated software.

In a short, written response Google Senior Vice President David C. Drummond said his company was cooperating with more than 10,000 publishers to put content on the Internet.

"The goal of search engines, and of products like Google Book Search and YouTube, is to help users find information from content producers of every size," Drummond said. "We do this by complying with international copyright laws and the result has been more exposure and in many cases more revenue for authors, publishers and producers of content."

Though executives at Google and Microsoft often criticize each other's business practices and products in private, they have rarely allowed their differences to bubble over in public. Two years ago, Microsoft went to court to prevent one of its former executives, Kai-Fu Lee, from opening a Google research center in China, arguing that he had broken a no-compete contract. But while that legal fight was nasty at times, it never included the kind of public tongue lashing offered by Rubin yesterday.

Edward J. Black, president of the Computer and Communications Industry Association, came to Google's defense, saying Microsoft wrongly characterized copyright law. Both companies are members of the Washington-based association.

"Contrary to Microsoft's suggestion, every unauthorized use of a copyrighted work is not infringement," Black said. As an example of these "fair use" exceptions, he pointed to how search engines developed by both Google and Microsoft are legally permitted to make copies of Web sites as part of the search process. "Microsoft would do well to consider that its own business depends on fair use before brushing aside that important doctrine," he said.

Microsoft's Accusations Against Google Don't Impress Copyright Gurus (LAW)

By Jessie Seyfer, The Recorder

California Recorder, March 7, 2007

DOJ_NMG_0141516

Copyright experts scoffed Tuesday at attempts by a top Microsoft lawyer to discredit Google's approach to copyrighted material.

Most believed Associate General Counsel Thomas Rubin's speech before a book conference -- as well as his opinion piece in the Financial Times -- had a lot more to do with Microsoft's vicious competition with Google than about solid legal arguments.

"Clearly they're in a pitched battle," said Mark Flagel, a partner with Latham & Watkins in Los Angeles. "Microsoft is doing everything it can to pick its fights. This is a popular one."

In a speech before the Association of American Publishers, Rubin accused Google of systematically violating copyright law. Google's Book Search and YouTube video sites are the perpetrators of these injustices, according to Rubin.

"Concocting a novel 'fair use' theory, Google bestowed upon itself the unilateral right to make entire copies of copyrighted books not covered by these publisher agreements without first obtaining the copyright holder's permission," Rubin's speech read. "Anyone who visits YouTube ... will immediately recognize that it follows a similar cavalier approach to copyright."

Google disputes that it violates any copyright laws. Its book search site allows people to search texts of many copyrighted books, the company maintains, but if a copyright owner has not consented, the searcher will only see a snippet of the copyrighted book.

That's a critical distinction for legal analysts. It's one thing, they say, to offer a search of a book's text and quite another to make an entire copyrighted book available, without permission, for copying -- which Google maintains it does not do. Google also claims it removes copyrighted songs and video from YouTube any time it is notified of infringement.

"The goal of search engines, and of products like Google Book Search and YouTube, is to help users find information from content producers of every size," David Drummond, Google's chief legal officer, said in a statement in response to Rubin's speech. "We do this by complying with international copyright laws, and the result has been more exposure and in many cases more revenue for authors, publishers and producers of content."

Rubin cast Microsoft's own book search as superior on copyright treatment. Experts didn't find this a surprising move given that Google, with its recent online word processing and spreadsheet offerings, has begun to encroach on Microsoft's core software businesses.

Microsoft has reacted to Google's success in recent years by beefing up its search capabilities, but may wind up harming itself with Rubin's arguments. After all, a lot of the law is unsettled when it comes to copyright protection in the digital age, said Eric Goldman, director of Santa Clara University School of Law's High Tech Law Institute.

"It's a very dangerous game for Microsoft to go out and push a major player in this space on copyright issues," Goldman said. "It's entirely possible that if they succeed in painting Google into a box, they may have inflicted a wound on themselves."

Courts are still grappling with whether Google's approach to books constitutes "fair use" under copyright law, Flagel said. Judges are also weighing whether Google should be held responsible for providing information, in search results for instance, about businesses that infringe on other people's copyrights.

The 9th Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals is expected to rule on three related cases on that subject by the end of the summer, said Fred Von Lohmann, a staff attorney for the Electronic Frontier Foundation in San Francisco.

Von Lohmann said Rubin's speech, which played up the fact that Microsoft asks copyright holders' permission before using their works, highlighted a way of thinking that he finds highly disturbing. Seeking permission from movie studios and publishing houses before using their material for a new innovation might be something Microsoft -- with its resources -- can do easily, but small-time innovators can't, Von Lohmann said.

"If you're a startup in a garage, is Hollywood going to return your calls if you're trying to develop something like YouTube?" he said. "Do you think they would have been able to launch a company if they had to negotiate permission?"

He continued: "The question here is not about do you like Google better or Microsoft. The question is, do you want a world where you can innovate first, or you have to hire lawyers and ask Hollywood's permission."

Terms Of Microsoft Settlement Be Told April 18 (DMR)

Des Moines Register, March 7, 2007

Terms of the settlement of Iowa's class action lawsuit against Microsoft Corp. will be announced on April 18, two days earlier than previously announced.

The date for the court hearing at which the terms are to be presented to Polk County District Court Judge Scott Rosenberg was moved up because of a conflict on the original date of April 20, Rosenberg said today.

The anti-trust law suit was nearly three months into a jury trial in Des Moines, and well behind schedule, when lawyers for both sides announced a settlement on Feb. 14.

The annoucement ended the trial, which had been expected to last well into the summer months.

Lawyers representing Iowans who purchased Microsoft's Windows, Office, Word and Excel software between 1994 and 2006 had sought damages of up to $330 million based on allegations of illegal anti-competitive actions by Microsoft.

Settlements of similar cases in other states have resulted in distribution of discount coupons for future purchases of Microsoft equipment with half of the unclaimed settlements going to public education agencies.

Officials have said the Iowa Department of Education will receive half of the unclaimed settlement here, but they have not said how large the settlement will be or if coupons will be used.

Terms of the settlement, as well as claiming instructions for Iowa purchasers, will be disclosed at the April 18 hearing.

Microsoft's Rocky Road To Mac Office 97 (CNET)

By Dawn Kawamoto, Staff Writer, CNET News.com

CNET News.com, March 7, 2007

According to court documents, the founder of Microsoft's Macintosh Business Unit fought a hard battle to keep Mac Office 97 alive.

In 1997, Apple wasn't the only place to house Mac evangelists--try Microsoft.

Ben Waldman, a then-Microsoft executive who founded the company's Macintosh Business Unit, fought a hard battle to keep Mac Office 97 a viable project, according to court documents in the recently settled Iowa class action antitrust suit against Microsoft.

In an e-mail to Microsoft co-founder Bill Gates, Waldman makes a passionate case for finishing Mac Office 97 and ramping up marketing and sales support for Microsoft's Mac products, according to a copy of the e-mail submitted in the antitrust case.

Waldman's pleas came just six months after Microsoft touted its plans to launch a business unit devoted to Mac, as well as release new versions of its FrontPage and Office software for the Mac.

His e-mail called for finishing Mac Office 97, despite difficulties and frustrations between the software giant and Apple in negotiations over an undisclosed issue. Approximately six weeks after Waldman sent his e-mail, Microsoft announced a $150 million investment in Apple that called for developing and shipping future versions of Microsoft Office, Internet Explorer and development tools for the Macintosh.

Prior to that investment, however, Mac Office 97 was in a tenuous position.

"The threat to cancel Mac Office 97 is certainly the strongest bargaining point we have, as doing so will do a great deal of harm to Apple immediately," Waldman noted. "Regardless of the outcome of these discussions, though, I believe we should ship Mac Office 97."

He added: "Furthermore, I believe we need to decide this immediately--our indecision so far has caused quite a bit of harm, and this will become far worse very shortly, as we are not only close to shipping code externally, but need to finally start press and customer communications, especially with Macworld a month away."

In laying out his arguments, Waldman cited the high motivation of his team and the effect on their morale if Microsoft were to pull out, a desire to keep the software giant's integrity intact after promising new versions of Office to users and Wall Street, the proximity to an external beta ship date of August 27, as well as the quality of the product.

"We are creating a good product, perhaps the last one. I really believe that we are creating the right product, a product that we can feel good about, and that will be well-received by customers, press and analysts," Waldman said. "Our focus has been to build on the base of Win Office 97 and create a great Macintosh product for Macintosh users, which is 100 percent interoperable with the Windows product."

He also cited the ability to use Mac Office 97 as a means to test products and marketing concepts before rolling them out in Windows Office.

"Because Mac Office is so much less critical to our business than Windows, we have the flexibility to test out new things in the product and in its marketing before we try them on Windows," Waldman said, adding, "I've personally also found the Mac market interesting because I've seen so many trends appear there first, and eventually become important on Windows."

Concerns over hard disk size, memory utilization and too many unnecessary features, or "bloatware," became a real issue in Office 97--complaints that were similar to ones heard years earlier when Mac Office 4 hit the market, Waldman noted.

"We heard exactly the same thing for Mac Office 4 three years ago, when we weren't really hearing it on Windows," he noted.

Waldman also lamented the lack of marketing and sales support for the company's Mac products. He cited cases where Microsoft sales representatives would try to sell its Mac customers on the notion of switching products, rather than addressing their interest in Microsoft's Mac software.

He also pointed to the effect that marketing had on Microsoft's Mac sales, especially in markets where Apple had seen a decline.

"Despite Apple's 20 percent drop in units in France, Mac Office sales were up 7 percent...How did we do so well? We actually did some marketing!" Waldman said.

Gates, in response to Waldman's e-mail, replied: "I appreciate your mail. It shows the kind of passion about great products that has made Microsoft successful. I admit we have neglected the Mac business."

Microsoft's Macintosh Business Unit issued a statement on Tuesday saying that the company has been developing native Mac software for more than 22 years and those products include compatibility with Office for Windows.

"We're committed to the ongoing development of our products, and are excited to deliver the first Universal version of Office--Office 2008 for Mac--in the second half of this year," Microsoft said. "Apple recognizes our commitment and contributions to the Mac market, and supports our efforts."

Microsoft noted that at Macworld 2006, the software giant announced a five-year agreement to produce Office specifically for the Mac.

"We are proud of our longstanding history of developing first-class productivity software on the Mac platform and will continue to do so," Microsoft said.

EU Rethinks Plans To Split Energy Groups (FT)

By Sarah Laitner And Bertrand Benoit

Financial Times, March 7, 2007

Brussels is considering a fresh approach to opening European Union energy markets amid indications that national leaders will this week signal their opposition to a forced break-up of big electricity and natural gas companies.

The European Commission is looking at a compromise plan under which regional grid operators could be established to help spur -competition and investment in the sector.

Such a move might prove more acceptable to heavyweight opponents in Paris and Berlin. They lead opposition to the Commission's proposal to force ownership separation of companies such as EdF of France and Eon of Germany, which generate power and own the grids through which it is supplied.

Officially, Brussels says the forced break-up of large, integrated energy groups through "ownership unbundling" is the best way to overhaul the sector, allow new companies to enter and give consumers more choice.

However, privately, EU officials acknowledge the opposition of some countries to that plan. They hope that EU leaders will call for further legislative action at their meeting tomorrow and on Friday.

The Commission has suggested a second, less radical option that would allow energy groups to hand over management of grids to independent operators while retaining ownership.

At the heart of the latest revised suggestion are cross-border versions of these independent operators. They would run networks on behalf of the companies, working in regional groups across the EU.

Angela Merkel, the chancellor of Germany, which holds the EU's rotating -presidency, will chair the Brussels summit of national leaders.

In an interview with the Financial Times, Ms Merkel said: "I'm in favour of competition. It is a precondition for an efficient European energy policy.

"We have many traditions in Europe. Fourteen member states already have unbundling. Others, like Germany, have a different tradition. I do not think the issue of competition can be reduced to the unbundling question."

She added: "Stripping the energy producers of their networks is no guarantee that they won't build cartels. What you need is a strong regulatory system and the right incentives to invest."

EU officials have cautioned that the revised idea is far from a fait accompli within the Commission.

EU Regulators Plot Breakup Of Utilities As Politicians Waver (BLOOM)

By James G. Neuger

Bloomberg, March 7, 2007

March 7 (Bloomberg) -- European Union regulators are determined to break up big utilities like Electricite de France SA and E.ON AG -- and they won't let governments stand in the way.

France, in the midst of a presidential campaign, will spearhead the charge at an EU summit starting tomorrow against a proposal to split power producers from transmission businesses in the 250 billion-euro ($328 billion) gas and electricity market.

The European Commission, the EU's central regulator, is pursuing an untested strategy to defeat the politicians: it plans to investigate utilities for abusing their dominant market positions and slap fines on companies it finds guilty.

``There will be no doubts about our determination to go on with the continuation of the competition rules regarding the energy market," European Commission President Jose Barroso said March 5. ``Not all the member states agree."

DOJ_NMG_0141519

With oil prices above $60 a barrel, EU leaders are targeting cheaper gas and electricity as the key to spurring an economy that has lagged behind the U.S. for most of the past decade. The squabble will be over how to get there during discussions at the two-day summit in Brussels.

Countries like Britain -- where Prime Minister Tony Blair's office gets its electricity from a French company and its water from a German one -- are pushing for less state control and less regulation.

Fiercest Pushback

Forcing power producers to sell off transmission grids is ``urgent,'' EU Competition Commissioner Neelie Kroes said last month. ``It is simply not the case that waiting for the implementation of existing legislation across member states will be enough.''

Following the template for cross-Channel arguments over economic management, the fiercest pushback is coming from France, home to state-owned EDF, Europe's biggest power generator and the pride of French trade unions.

Keeping EDF in state hands and abandoning the current government's planned merger of Suez SA and Gaz de France SA is the economic rallying cry of Segolene Royal, the Socialist candidate for president in elections in April and May. Royal has vowed to renationalize EDF and merge it with GDF if elected.

Winning over France ``will be very difficult,'' Danish Foreign Minister Per Stig Moeller told reporters March 1. ``You see for instance in the French presidential campaign what role that plays.''

President Jacques Chirac, making his second-to-last EU summit appearance of his 12 years in office, will pitch France's alternative plan to require power producers to provide fair access to networks -- and leave regulation at the national level.

French Allies

France has found close to a dozen allies like Austria, which warned that the forced sale of power-transmission businesses could put key national assets under foreign ownership.

``The big money is in Russia with the energy monopolies, with the Chinese foreign capital and with the American pension funds,'' Austrian Chancellor Alfred Gusenbauer said in a Feb. 26 interview in Vienna. ``I don't think it would be good to hand control over grids outside of Europe.''

A summit stalemate would shine the spotlight on Kroes, who is already probing utilities including E.ON, Gaz de France and Eni SpA for possible collusion. The companies have said they are cooperating with investigators.

Whether the commission could wield the antitrust ax to split up Europe's energy giants is an open question. Its powers in this area are in question and, as last year's squabbles over cross- border energy mergers showed, are sure to run into national obstacles.

France, for example, stage-managed the Suez-Gaz de France merger -- now held up by dissident investors and unions -- to thwart a possible bid for Suez by Italy's Enel SpA. Spain imposed curbs on E.ON's takeover of Endesa SA. Now Kroes may have to go to court to force Spain to drop the restrictions.

Freedom of Choice

Sixteen countries -- including Germany, France, the U.K., Italy, Spain and Poland -- are ignoring parts of existing EU legislation that gives customers freedom of choice when picking power and gas suppliers.

Energy was catapulted to the top of the European political agenda by the rise in prices and moves by President Vladimir Putin of Russia, the source of a quarter of the EU's natural gas, to assert control over Russian oil and gas resources.

Russia, the world's largest gas producer, agreed in January to cooperate with Algeria on natural gas exploration and marketing, leading Putin to muse about a ``gas OPEC'' and stirring concerns in Europe.

Putin is exploiting the EU's internal divisions by lining up former German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder to manage a 5 billion- euro natural gas pipeline from Russia to Germany -- a project that is getting flak from Poland and Sweden.

``Poland is afraid that Russia could cut it off from energy supplies,'' European Parliament President Hans-Gert Poettering said in a Feb. 28 interview in Berlin. ``And that's why it's important for us to show solidarity with Poland.''

Binding Targets

EU leaders are also split over a commission call to set a binding target for renewable energy to make up 20 percent of European power consumption by 2020. The costs would be too high, poorer eastern countries say.

There is more unity on a commission call for a 30 percent cut in greenhouse gas emissions by 2020, as long as other industrial countries join the fight against climate change.

A Swing And A Miss (LAT)

The Los Angeles Times, March 7, 2007

MEMO TO SEN. John F. Kerry (D-Mass.) and Federal Communications Commission Chairman Kevin J. Martin: Baseball is the national pastime, not the nationalized one.

DOJ_NMG_0141520

Kerry and Martin are crying foul over a deal being negotiated by Major League Baseball and DirecTV, the leading satellite service in the country. The agreement would sell the TV rights to "out of market" games — the ones played by non-hometown teams — exclusively to DirecTV. The same package is available today to an estimated 75 million subscribers to the various cable TV and satellite systems; the pending deal would cut that number to DirecTV's universe of 15 million customers. At the same time, the deal would create a new, 24-hour baseball channel on DirecTV.

Kerry, playing the populist card like the presidential candidate he used to be, has ginned up a Senate hearing to determine whether Congress should step in. "I have serious problems with any mega-deal that makes it harder for people across the country to follow their favorite baseball team," he said last month. At Kerry's request, Martin launched an inquiry to determine whether new laws were needed to protect fans.

Evidently, we've come quite a long way since 1992, when Congress ordered the FCC to make sure cable operators such as Comcast and Time Warner Cable didn't withhold the programs and networks they owned (e.g., a regional sports network or Time Warner's HBO) from the fledgling satellite industry. Now it's DirecTV, which still has a fraction of the customers that cable does, with too much power? Although the service is controlled by media giant News Corp., there's no unholy combination here of content provider and distributor. Instead, the proposed deal involves a copyright owner — Major League Baseball — and its ability to sell the rights to its programs to whomever it wishes. It's no different from the National Football League moving "Monday Night Football" from free TV (ABC) to cable (ESPN).

Nor is there any public entitlement to televised baseball. Yes, fans who want to watch out-of-market games but who aren't DirecTV subscribers would be inconvenienced by the pending deal. Those who won't or can't switch to the satellite service can sign up for Major League Baseball's online broadcasts, which the league says will have the same picture quality as conventional TV. Of course, the webcasts wouldn't deliver the same experience unless viewers had a high-speed Internet line and a PC connected to their TV. Everyone else would have to settle for watching games on their computers or not watching them at all.

Is this a bad thing for fans? Probably. Is it a bad thing for the game? That's for the league to decide, not Congress or the FCC. The proposed deal is similar to the exclusive ones DirecTV has struck with the NFL and NASCAR, neither of which brought down Washington's regulatory fist. Kerry and Martin should stay in the bleachers and let the business of baseball operate like a business.

ENVIRONMENT/INDIAN AFFAIRS:

Feds Issue Subpoenas In Fatal BP Blast (HC)

By Kristen Hays, Houston Chronicle

Houston Chronicle, March 7, 2007

BP disclosed today that the Justice Department has issued grand jury subpoenas for documents and testimony to determine whether any criminal conduct was involved in the March 2005 explosion at the company's Texas City refinery that killed 15 people and injured scores more.

The London-based oil giant disclosed that subpoenas had been issued in its 2006 annual report, which was released today.

The company acknowledged a year ago that the Justice Department had opened an investigation after the U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration issued citations alleging more than 300 violations of OSHA standards, imposed a $21.3 million fine and ordered a series of actions intended to improve safety at the plant.

OSHA referred the matter to the Justice Department after concluding its probe into the blast.

"We've acknowledged before that DOJ is carrying out an investigation," BP spokesman Neil Chapman said today.

BP said in the report issued today that the company is cooperating with the Justice Department's investigation.

The company also is cooperating with investigations by the Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board. The CSB is expected to issue its final report on the blast later this month.

Last October federal prosecutors issued a wide-ranging subpoena to Brent Coon, a Beaumont lawyer whose clients have included a woman whose parents died in the blast. He also represents workers who were injured and nearby residents who claim their property was damaged.

Coon said today that he had already shared documents gathered in explosion-related civil litigation with the investigating agencies.

Once he received the subpoena, he said he gave the Justice Department a passcode that investigators could use to access an electronic document database so they could examine everything with no need of a middleman.

DOJ_NMG_0141521

"We've been in full cooperation, actually keeping them up to date. Of course, they don't tell us what they're doing," Coon said.

kristen.hays@chron.com

U.S. To Owe Billions For Delays In Nuclear Dump, Official Says (NYT)

By Matthew L. Wald

New York Times, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON, March 6 — The federal government will owe $7 billion in damages for delays in opening a nuclear waste dump if the repository opens in 2017 — the earliest date now possible — and any further delay will raise the price half a billion dollars a year, the head of the radioactive waste program said Tuesday.

The money would reimburse current and former nuclear plant operators who signed contracts under which the federal government agreed to begin accepting their wastes in 1998.

The official, Edward F. Sproat III, director of the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, said progress toward opening a waste repository at Yucca Mountain, Nev., near Las Vegas, had been slowed by lack of money, despite a $19.5 billion fund financed by a fee on each kilowatt-hour of electricity generated by reactors.

He said the administration would ask Congress on Wednesday for easier access to the money. But he also acknowledged that the schedule had been hurt by problems in his office and with its contractors; 60 percent of the work his office is doing this year involves reanalyzing data that was rejected earlier because of signs of fraud.

The administration will also request that the site be permitted to store more than the 70,000 metric tons originally set by Congress. That limit was set with the idea that the Energy Department would look for a second site, but it has made small progress toward opening the first one.

Mr. Sproat spoke at a breakfast sponsored by The Energy Daily, a trade publication, and Areva, a reactor vendor.

The nuclear waste issue has become more acute because for the first time since the 1970s, companies want to build new reactors, according to Mr. Sproat and others. But Mr. Sproat said investors would not lend money for construction unless the Energy Department resumed offering contracts to the utilities for waste disposal.

$7B Settlement Proposed In Indian Case (AP)

By Mary Clare Jalonick, Associated Press Writer

AP, March 7, 2007

The U.S. government has proposed paying $7 billion partly to settle lawsuits over the management of Indian trust lands — an offer met with immediate objections from Indian plaintiffs.

At issue is a decade-old lawsuit by Indians against the government claiming that the government has mismanaged more than $100 billion in oil, gas, timber and other royalties held in trust from their lands dating back to 1887.

The litigation, filed in 1996 by Blackfeet Indian Elouise Cobell, deals with individual Indians' lands. Several tribes have also sued, claiming mismanagement of their lands.

Senate Indian Affairs Committee Chairman Byron Dorgan, D-N.D., said he will hold hearings on the proposal and said the settlement offer is the first time the federal government has acknowledged a multibillion dollar liability for mismanagement of the trust funds over the past century.

"That is a significant admission," Dorgan said, adding that he believes the conditions attached to the settlement offer will be controversial.

Associate Deputy Interior Secretary James Cason, who has overseen Indian issues in past years, took issue with Dorgan's words. He said the proposal is not an admission but a "recognition that where we are right now is not very productive."

Cobell and one of her attorneys, Keith Harper, said the Interior Department is asking for too much.

Under the terms of the offer, the government would pay $7 billion over ten years, without interest. In exchange for the money, all tribal and individual mismanagement claims against the government would be dropped and the government would be relieved of future liability.

The proposal would also end, over a period of 10 years, most of the government's responsibilities to manage Indian trust lands and would consolidate ownership of Indian lands, which are now often held by many people.

Cason said roughly half of the $7 billion would go toward settling individual and tribal claims, with the remainder covering other parts of the proposal.

Interior Secretary Dirk Kempthorne and Attorney General Alberto Gonzales sent the proposal to Dorgan last week, saying they strongly support comprehensive legislation that would help the parties move "from a litigation-oriented relationship to one of economic prosperity, empowerment and self-reliance for tribes and individual Indians."

DOJ_NMG_0141522

Harper said the proposal is an insult.

"There's no sum specific for how much is going to be used for Cobell," he said. "It's pennies on the dollar."

He said the plaintiffs estimate the government's liability could exceed $100 billion, though they have in the past considered settling for less.

Cobell said the government is trying to do too much at once.

"It's not fair to throw every problem that exists in Indian country that has been created by the Department of Interior into our lawsuit," she said. "This lawsuit is about individual Indians and accounting."

Interior Department spokesman Shane Wolfe said the department looks forward to working with Congress on the proposal. Congress has attempted to wade into the dispute in recent years, but has yet to find resolution.

"We believe this proposal looks to the future," he said.

In Arizona Desert, Indian Trackers Vs. Smugglers (NYT)

By Randal C. Archibold

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

TOHONO O'ODHAM NATION, Ariz. — A fresh footprint in the dirt, fibers in the mesquite. Harold Thompson reads the signs like a map.

They point to drug smugglers, 10 or 11, crossing from Mexico. The deep impressions and spacing are a giveaway to the heavy loads on their backs. With no insect tracks or paw prints of nocturnal creatures marking the steps, Mr. Thompson determines the smugglers probably crossed a few hours ago.

"These guys are not far ahead; we'll get them," said Mr. Thompson, 50, a strapping Navajo who follows the trail like a bloodhound.

At a time when all manner of high technology is arriving to help beef up security at the Mexican border — infrared cameras, sensors, unmanned drones — there is a growing appreciation among the federal authorities for the American Indian art of tracking, honed over generations by ancestors hunting animals.

Mr. Thompson belongs to the Shadow Wolves, a federal law enforcement unit of Indian officers that has operated since the early 1970s on this vast Indian nation straddling the Mexican border.

Tracking skills are in such demand that the Departments of State and Defense have arranged for the Shadow Wolves to train border guards in other countries, including some central to the fight against terrorism. Several officers are going to train border police in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, which border Afghanistan, and in several other countries.

In the renewed push to secure the border with Mexico, the curbing of narcotics trafficking often gets less public attention than the capturing of illegal immigrants.

But the 15-member Shadow Wolves unit, part of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, is recruiting members to reach the congressionally authorized complement of 21. And the immigration agency is considering forming a sister unit to patrol part of the Canadian border at the Blackfeet reservation in Montana, where concern about drug trafficking is growing.

"Detecting is one thing, and apprehending is something entirely different," said Rodney Irby, a special agent in Tucson for the immigration agency who helps supervise the Shadow Wolves. "I applaud the technology; it will only make the border more secure. But there are still going to be groups of people who penetrate the most modern technology, and we need a cadre of agents and officers to apprehend them."

The Shadow Wolves have seized nearly 30,000 pounds of illegal drugs since October, putting them on pace to meet or exceed previous annual seizure amounts. They routinely seize some 100,000 pounds of illegal drugs a year, Mr. Irby said.

They home in on drug smugglers, who use less-traveled cattle tracks, old wagon-wheel trails and barely formed footpaths to ferry their loads to roads and highways about 40 miles from the border.

The Tohono land, which is the size of Connecticut and the third-largest reservation in area in the country, has long vexed law enforcement. Scores of people die crossing here every year in the searing, dry heat of summer or the frigid cold of winter. And its 76-mile-long border with Mexico, marked in most places with a three- or four-strand barbed-wire fence that is easy to breach, is a major transshipment point for marijuana, Mexico's largest illicit crop.

Adding to the challenge is that drug smugglers have enlisted tribal members or forced them into cooperation, sometimes stashing their loads in the ramshackle houses dotting the landscape or paying the young to act as guides. Several tribal members live on the Mexican side, and those on the American side have long freely crossed the border, which they usually do through a few informal entry points that drug traffickers, too, have picked up on.

How much the Shadow Wolves disrupt the criminal organizations is debated. Officials said they believed the group's work at least complicated drug smuggling operations — the Shadow Wolves have received death threats over the years — but they said they could not estimate the amount of drugs making it through.

Marvin Eleando, a Tohono who retired from the unit in 2004, said he believed the Shadow Wolves got just a small fraction of the drugs moving through the Tohono lands. Mr. Eleando estimated it would take about 100 Shadow Wolves to truly foil the smugglers, who employ spotters on mountaintops who watch for officers and then shift routes accordingly.

Still, he said, the unit must keep up the effort because the drugs, and the gun violence often associated with trafficking, imperil tribal members.

"The kids get mixed up in this and then don't want to work anymore," Mr. Eleando said.

Lately, according to the Border Patrol and Immigration and Customs Enforcement, drug seizures in Arizona, and especially around the reservation and the Tucson area, have surged, and the size of the loads found has increased.

Officials said it was too soon to tell whether the uptick signaled a long-term pattern. But they believed it could be partly explained by the additional staffing on the border. Law enforcement officials said that there also appeared to be a bumper crop of marijuana in Mexico and that smugglers seemed to be trying to ship tons of it ahead of government crackdowns there.

"We never know how much is being pushed in our direction," said David V. Aguilar, the chief of the Border Patrol, though he added that it seemed the amount was "higher at this point."

Alonzo Peña, the agent in charge of Immigration and Customs Enforcement in Arizona, said investigators had many theories but little concrete information to explain the increase in trafficking.

"Is this marijuana that has been sitting in warehouses, and they are trying to get rid of it now that there is a strong hand in Mexico?" Mr. Peña said. "We just don't know other than that we are seeing more loads and bigger loads in many areas."

The Shadow Wolves, established with a handful of officers in 1972 as part of what was then the United States Customs Service, were the first federal law enforcement officers allowed on Tohono land.

The federal government agreed to the Tohono O'odham Nation's demand that the officers have American Indian ancestry, a requirement still in place. Members are at least one-quarter Indian, and the current group represents seven tribes, including the Tohono.

While other law enforcement agencies, including the Border Patrol, use tracking, the Shadow Wolves believe that their experience and their Indian ancestry give them an edge, particularly here.

"I speak the language, so when we are dealing with elderly members in particular I can make them more comfortable," said Gary Ortega, a Tohono who has been in the Shadow Wolves for nine years. "They are willing to tell us things they know or see that they may not tell another federal agent or officer."

There is also, of course, the thrill of the hunt.

On a recent day, Mr. Thompson picked up the track around 3 a.m. and, with Mr. Ortega, stayed on it for nearly 12 hours through thorny thickets and wide-open desert. As the terrain grew craggy, Mr. Thompson kept a brisk pace, with Mr. Ortega and other officers leapfrogging ahead to help find the trail.

"Every chase is just a little different," Mr. Ortega said, barely pausing as he followed the prints in the sand.

It grew easier as the sun rose and the smugglers kept bumping into thorny bushes and stopping to rest, leaving their food wrappers behind and coat fibers in the cat-claw brush. By midafternoon, Mr. Ortega and Mr. Thompson were tiring, too. But the scent of the men's burlap sacks perked up Mr. Ortega, and he quickened his pace, finally catching sight of the smugglers and prompting them to bolt from their resting spot.

Left behind were 10 bales of marijuana, 630 pounds in total, a fairly typical bust, with a street value of more than $315,000.

With the weight off their backs, the smugglers showed new speed dashing to hiding places and easily outmatched their pursuers. Other Shadow Wolves drove out to pick up the load, finding their colleagues resting on the bales and grinning in satisfaction.

"When we get the dope or the guys," Mr. Thompson said, "that's when it ends."

FBI/DEA/ATF/USMS:

A Mayor Cracks Down On Gangs (CNN)

CNN, March 6, 2007

(CNN) -- Los Angeles, California, Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa introduced in February an aggressive initiative to combat the surge of gang-related violence in his city.

The plan includes publicly identifying several of the most violent gangs and gang members and includes calls for international help.

"We have had tremendous success in reducing overall crime, crime is down for the fifth straight year," the mayor told reporters at a February news conference.

"But as crime continues to drop overall, we begin to see a glaring exception to the trend with the rise in gang crime. Street gangs are responsible for the majority of all murders in Los Angeles, and nearly 70 percent of all the shootings."

He added, "We tend to think about gangs as problems plaguing individual neighborhoods and individual communities, but as we all know, the world is flat. Gang violence is now a problem of international scope; we must face it on an international scale."

Previously, law enforcement agencies did not identify individuals or gangs for fear of boosting their street reputation, according to the Los Angeles Police Department's Web site. But a 14 percent spike in gang-related crime over the last year and a 160 percent increase in some San Fernando neighborhoods, according to Villaraigosa, had the mayor and law officials scrambling for solutions.

The new plan includes a coordinated effort among local and state agencies, as well as federal agencies, such as the FBI and the DEA.

But for Villaraigosa, enforcement is only half of the solution. The root causes of gang violence must also be addressed, he said. (Listen to Villaraigosa talk about his city's problem with gangs)

Those causes include "the break up of the families, ... poverty, lack of education, lack of skills, job skills, the lack of hope in communities," Villaraigosa told CNN in a recent interview.

Villaraigosa may as well have been describing his early life. The 54-year-old mayor grew up poor and fatherless in the City Terrace neighborhood of East Los Angeles. "I grew up in a part of the city that was one of the poor areas ... and was in trouble from time to time, kicked out of school, dropped out of another," he said.

The mayor says these experiences gives him a unique understanding of the gang crisis. "As someone whose life is a poster child for redemption, I believe strongly that we have to believe in people," he said. "We can't just give up on people."

Villaraigosa, who took office in July 2005, is the first Los Angeles mayor of Mexican descent in more than a century. He is married to Corina Villaraigosa, and has four children.

A Friday Night On The Front Lines Of L.A.'s Gang Wars (CSM)

By Daniel B. Wood, Staff Writer Of The Christian Science Monitor

The Christian Science Monitor, March 7, 2007

Los Angeles saw a 14 percent jump in gang-related violent crime last year.

LOS ANGELES

Sgt. Sean Colomey patrols the most gang-ridden neighborhood in the gang capital of America. It is his job to lead 28 specially trained police through an area where assault weapons seem as common as grass, graffiti "tags" define the turf, and 7 of every 100 residents are members of one gang or another.

He is just the man Police Commissioner Anthony Pacheco wants to know.

A wave of gang violence, one that some say is the most vicious in city history, has engulfed Los Angeles, and the city's police are mounting an equally historic response. It is Commissioner Pacheco's job to assess how effectively the LAPD is confronting the gangs – whether it has the tools and personnel it needs, whether police tactics stay within the law. He sees the response as a huge and necessary undertaking. No less than "the future safety of L.A. is at stake," Pacheco says.

So it is that on a recent Friday night Sergeant Colomey, the gang expert, and Pacheco, a civilian appointed to serve as one of five LAPD commissioners, meet in the parking lot of the Southeast Division headquarters at the corner of 108th and Main Streets. Pacheco will ride along on this shift – it's a chance to pick Colomey's brain about gang rivalries, to catch the cop's-eye view of the action. This ride-along, like others he's been on over the past 18 months, will help the commissioner decide for himself whether the police crackdown is having an effect.

It's just one night and just one lens on the gang problem, but Pacheco feels it's a vital perspective to gain.

Colomey slides on a bulletproof vest, and hands one to the commissioner. Velcro closes them tight, but it's small comfort. The vests can stop bullets from handguns, but not from AK47s. A Chinese-made copy of the notorious Russian assault rifle can be had on the streets for about $100.

"It's all over the place," Colomey says of the gun. "It's a military weapon that will send a bullet through you and the next guy and the house next door and keep on going."

* * *

The latest crime report came as something of a shock to many Los Angelenos. Crime rates had dropped citywide for five straight years, mirroring the trend in other major metropolises. But last year L.A. as a whole saw a 14 percent jump in gang-related violent crime. Police say there are 39,000 gang members in Los Angeles – and 15,000 of them are active in the compact area where Colomey and Pacheco will be on patrol.

DOJ_NMG_0141525

Colomey, though, was not shocked. His division, which encompasses Watts and South Central L.A., has logged roughly 500 shootings a year for the past few years.

On their ride together through this 9.3-square-mile community – 200,000 people boxed in by four freeways – Pacheco and Colomey are taking a kind of inventory of 65 gangs who police say rule these streets like terrorists. "They do everything that terrorist groups do ... rule by fear and intimidation, the threat of violence and murder in every area of these neighborhoods," says Colomey, a 17-year veteran.

It's the apparent spread of gang violence to additional parts of L.A. that has set in motion a kind of "Marshall Plan" attack on the problem, of which the LAPD response is one part. So far, police department action includes unprecedented collaboration with the feds: the FBI, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (ATF). It includes injunctions that restrict the activities of certain gang members and nuisance-abatement crackdowns that target gang hangouts. It includes formal lists of "most wanted" members and "most wanted" gangs and better-coordinated ways to track and prosecute them.

But there's also plain old enforcement, meaning a bigger show of force and more arrests. This night would make that clear.

* * *

About half of Colomey's gang enforcement detail is on duty at any given time, so the sergeant is set for a casual tour of "non-frontline" duty with the commissioner.

That plan changes in the first minute of his shift.

They set off first for the scene of an earlier shooting. But the parking lot is still visible in the rearview mirror when Colomey and five other cruisers are summoned for backup in a cocaine bust just blocks in the other direction. That's a sizable backup squad, but Colomey says the extra hands will be needed for crowd control – local residents who often press the perimeter of an arrest scene.

At least 100 locals have gathered in front yards, in fact. Some are taunting the cops and videotaping the onslaught of cruisers. A suspect is already in handcuffs, after an officer felled him with pepper spray. Police say the man is a gang member who was selling rock cocaine in plain view as a cruiser drove by, and that he had ignored police orders to "show your hands." "People from outside the area ask us, is it really that blatant ... the disregard for authority and police?" says Colomey. "I tell them, yes, they are not deterred by us at all."

As Colomey walks between officers at the scene, a woman with a video camera to her eye says, "You don't have no business here. You can't come in here without a warrant. Go ahead, just try to come in here. I've got my eye on you...."

The antagonism is a testament to a long and tense history between the LAPD and Watts, a patchwork neighborhood of single-story, single-family homes, most with manicured front yards but barred windows, too. This is one of the places where riots erupted after police were acquitted in the 1994 Rodney King beating case, and again in 1995 and 1996 after the O.J. Simpson trials.

Now relations are taut again as police try to clamp down on violence they say is rooted in bitter rivalries between black and Hispanic gangs.

"There are four major wars going on right now [within the Southeast Division]," Colomey tells Pacheco, ticking off pairs of combatants.

The Southeast Division is not the only part of Los Angeles that appears to be spiraling closer toward race war. In recent months, altercations between black and Hispanic gang members have spilled from L.A. streets into the county jail and back to the streets, a vicious cycle of revenge and competition that has bred more violence. Even among law-abiding residents here, black-Latino relations have soured, as some feel they are losing out on jobs, affordable housing, and public spaces such as parks.

The result is a thick layer of fear that, some neighborhood activists say, has descended on this city like a pot lid. In all his years of duty, says Colomey, he's never seen the climate so foreboding in so many pockets of L.A., including Watts.

In such a climate, a kind of siege mentality can set in. Driving past a liquor store at 87th Street and Compton Avenue, Colomey points out groups of girls outside and in cars across the street, and he notes that police don't have the luxury of assuming they are as innocent as they look.

"Many, many times we find that it is the women who hold the guns for their gang members, do the shootings, and aid in the escapes," he says.

The shootings, he adds, are always about three things: "drugs, money, guns."

Later, he adds a fourth: respect.

"Some guys might go to a dance and hit on a girl who's a girlfriend of an opposing gang [member], and her boyfriend shoots them. It can be as simple as that," says Colomey. "Then you got a retaliation war going on."

* * *

DOJ_NMG_0141526

From behind the wheel, Colomey offers his assessment of how well the LAPD's antigang measures are working. Chief William Bratton's new emphasis on coordinating with the ATF, FBI, and DEA is a dramatic change that is helping to gather evidence and prosecute gang members in ways that were impossible before, says the sergeant. "It used to be .... we didn't play well in the sandbox together. That's all over now."

Increased police backup from nongang units, another new initiative, is also creating a bigger show of force, he says. Several federal operations are in progress – attempts to disrupt and eventually dismantle gangs deemed to be the most troublesome and vicious.

By taking frequent ride-alongs, Pacheco says he can take note of mundane problems such as broken radios, an insufficient number of cruiser-based computers that connect police with databases and precinct dispatchers, and the need for cruiser-mounted video cameras. The videocams were called for after the Rodney King beating, but the LAPD is only now getting around to funding them. The Southeast Division is slated to get its first cruiser cams in coming months.

Another new tack is increased coordination with parole and probation officers. More of them have set up office in district headquarters, and the closer proximity to police is resulting in a better ability to give tipoffs about who is back on the streets from jail or prison.

Colomey drives Pacheco past three of his roughest neighborhoods: Nickerson Gardens, Imperial Heights, and Jordan Downs – housing projects with numbered buildings and bars on windows. A year ago, video surveillance cameras were installed on streetlight poles at Jordan Downs, enough to cover every inch of a six-block development. Since then, violent crime in the area dropped 41 percent, Colomey says.

"You are looking at what was one of the most violent and dangerous areas for violent crime in the entire US," says Colomey. "We think we are onto something that really works."

Pacheco says he has been distressed, on other ride-alongs, to see young children out and about at 11:30 p.m. or later. To him, it points to a culture of permissiveness, of parental absence and drug use. But it also yields more deaths of innocents, children killed by sprays of gang bullets aimed at someone else.

But this Friday night ride-along will end abruptly, well before 11:30.

* * *

Not long after leaving the cocaine bust, three separate radio frequencies crackle to life. It's bad: Shots have been fired at an officer, and the officer has returned fire. The dispatch continues, adding detail: Two suspects, alleged gang members, are fleeing in a black Thunderbird, apparently after having shot a man on the sidewalk.

Colomey flips on the siren and speeds down back streets, looking for the getaway car. He's on the radio, directing the response. A high-speed chase ensues, ending in a crash between the Thunderbird and another vehicle.

Arriving seconds later at the crash scene, Colomey and Pacheco see an overturned car, its driver lying on the sidewalk, and the Thunderbird, minus its front end ... and its occupants. The "perps," said to be carrying guns, have escaped into the neighborhood.

The next 90 minutes see the arrival of two helicopters, at least a dozen squad cars, three canine units (complete with assault rifles and Belgian dogs), several SWAT units, and three armored vehicles. Because an officer fired his weapon during the incident, and because two perpetrators with guns are at large, the megawatt response also includes the arrivals of Assistant Chief James McDonnell and South Bureau Chief Charlie Beck.

While copters overhead shine spotlights a half-mile from the scene, canine units begin going house to house looking for the suspects, a search that will last until morning.

* * *

Later, Pacheco sums up the Friday-night ride-along, in the context of dozens of others he has made as commissioner. For all the hoopla of the high-speed pursuit, multiple shootings, 'copters and canine units, the evening was also typically revealing in many respects, he says. Foremost, it showed "how thin the 'thin blue line' is," he says, how outgunned law officers are compared with the number of gangs and gang members.

It showed how exposed the police are to danger, leaving their cruisers to cuff gang members in hostile places. It showed, he says, the dedication and continued resolve of veteran officers amid a situation that has gone from bad to worse.

And, Pacheco adds, it underscored the conventional wisdom of those who've watched the gang crisis in L.A. for decades: "You can't arrest your self out of a gang problem."

Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger (R) is in line with that thinking, too. On Monday, he called for a statewide summit to forge a counterattack on street gangs – one that would involve both law-enforcement and gang-prevention measures.

It remains to seen whether L.A.'s extensive plan for facing down gangs – including job and community development, after-school programs, and other investments – can work.

DOJ_NMG_0141527

But Pacheco, for one, is determined to see that the gangs' grip on Los Angeles – which he characterizes as "wildly out of control" is diminished. His part of the answer, law enforcement, "is moving forward to confront gangs," he says.

At the same time, he is unwavering that "robust crime suppression must not violate laws." And he has taken a place on the front lines to help make sure that is the case.

Ice Cream Purchase Leads To Alleged Gang-member Arrest (LAT)

By Patrick Mcgreevy

The Los Angeles Times, March 7, 2007

Police Chief William J. Bratton today announced details of the arrest of a second member of the Los Angeles Police Department's list of the 10 most-wanted gang members -- the takedown of a murder suspect after he bought ice cream in Rosarito Beach, Mexico.

Steve "Loco" Garcia, 43, was taken into custody Friday after a four-day surveillance operation by Mexican authorities. They took him to the U.S. border and handed him over to representatives of the U.S. Marshal's Office, who then delivered him to the state prison in Chino, where he is being held on a parole violation.

Bratton said Garcia had been sought by police since the Feb. 12, 2001, slaying of a gang associate, Kenneth Landon, at a Sylmar motel.

The details of Garcia's capture came just days after police announced the arrest of another member of the LAPD list, Angel Zevallos, who is accused of attempted murder and was detained in Guatemala.

"Two down, eight to go," Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa said at a City Hall news conference with Bratton. "The capture and arrest of two of the most violent offenders in two weeks sends a clear message that violent offenders will be held accountable to the fullest extent of the law no matter where they run, no matter where they hide."

The mayor said targeting the most violent gang members is part of a strategy to reduce gang crime, which increased 15.7% last year in Los Angeles. Gang members were responsible for 56% of the homicides in Los Angeles last year.

L.A. officials conceded that Garcia had been he focus of a fugitive task force in Mexico for the last 18 months -- well before Bratton and Villaraigosa released the Top 10 list in February -- and that the reward offered by the city was not a factor in his arrest. But, Bratton said, publicizing the list of fugitives and a $50,000 reward for those on the list has generated information from the public on others.

"The purpose of the list is to refocus attention on these people that we have not been able to apprehend. In many instances they have fled the country," Bratton said.

Villaraigosa announced a replacement for Garcia on the list.

Arash Semerome Safaie, 32, is a member of the Hardtimes gang in the Santa Ana area and is wanted for shooting three people, one of them fatally, at a party on East 57th Street in the Newton area on Sept. 28, 2003. The shooting with a 9-mm semi-automatic handgun resulted in the death of 17-year-old Anna Vasquez.

Bratton said Safaie, who was born in Nayarit, Mexico, is believed to be on the run south of the border.

Villaraigosa said the arrests should silence naysayers who had warned that publicizing the names of targeted gang members would be counterproductive.

patrick.mcgreevy@latimes.com

Nanuet Couple Indicted In Nationwide Steroids Investigation (JN)

Journal News, March 6, 2007

ALBANY - Two people who ran a Nanuet medical business were indicted today in connection with a nationwide investigation into the illegal sale of steroids to prominent athletes and others.

Steven and Karen Lampert, who ran the Anti-Aging Centers at 259 N. Middletown Road, pleaded not guilty in Albany County Court and were released without bail.

The indictment charges the Lamperts with forging a Nanuet doctor's signature to prescriptions and submitting them to a Florida pharmacy for drugs totaling more than $50,000.

Steven Lampert is charged with 20 felony counts - nine counts each of fifth-degree criminal sale of a controlled substance and of second-degree forgery.

He and his wife are charged with a single counts of fourth-degree conspiracy and first-degree criminal diversion of prescription medications and prescriptions

A woman answering the phone at the medical building at 259 N. Middletown Road said today the Lamperts no longer were affiliated with the business.

DOJ_NMG_0141528

Albany County District Attorney P. David Soares called Signature Pharmacy one of the five largest steroid distributors in the country, his spokeswoman, Heather Orth said.

Today's arraignments come a day after not guilty pleas were entered in Albany by 11 other defendants, including four Signature Pharmacy officials.

Report: Rocker Admits Taking HGH (AP)

By Michael Hill, The Associated Press

AP, March 6, 2007

ALBANY, N.Y. -- Two more people linked to a nationwide investigation into the illegal sale of steroids were arraigned Tuesday on drug-related charges as published reports implicated more athletes, including former star relief pitcher John Rocker.

SI.com reported that Rocker, 1996 Olympic wrestling gold-medalist Kurt Angle, major leaguer David Bell and Victor Martinez, winner of the latest Ohio bodybuilding competition named for Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger, all showed up on a client list of Applied Pharmacy, a Mobile, Ala., company raided in connection with the investigation.

Rocker's publicist told the Daily News that he admitted taking HGH, now banned by Major League Baseball, but said it was for medical reasons.

"That was a growth hormone that was prescribed by a doctor in relation to his rotator cuff surgery in 2003, so I don't really think there is anything to the story," Debi Curzio, Rocker's publicist, told the Daily News for a story on the newspaper's Web site Tuesday night.

SI.com reported that Rocker received two prescriptions for somatropin between April and July 2003.

Steven and Karen Lampert of Anti-Aging Centers in Nanuet pleaded not guilty in an Albany County, N.Y., courtroom and were released without bail. They are charged with submitting prescriptions to a Florida pharmacy _ some "obviously forged" according to the district attorney _ for drugs totaling more than $50,000 for people without a medical need.

Steven Lampert is charged with 20 counts, his wife with two.

"It seems as though our clients have much less involvement than the others," said Jay Golland, a lawyer for Karen Lampert.

Prosecutors describe the Lamperts as "criminal associates" of Signature Pharmacy in Orlando, Fla. Albany County District Attorney David Soares says Signature was at the center of a web of businesses and doctors that illegally wrote prescriptions for steroids.

The arraignments come a day after not guilty pleas were entered in Albany by 11 other defendants, including four Signature Pharmacy officials.

Soares acknowledged that Martinez was an "unindicted co-conspirator" in the case and is linked to the Lamperts' Anti-Aging Centers. Martinez won the Arnold Classic bodybuilding competition Saturday in Ohio.

A spokesman for Schwarzenegger said he wants bodybuilders to stop using steroids.

"He's clearly opposed to these steroids," said Aaron McLear. "And he's working with top officials in the bodybuilding community to come up with a system where they rid the sport of steroids."

Martinez told The New York Times he bought testosterone from the Lamperts after their clinic told him he had low levels of the hormone. He also said the company asked him to become a partner, but he declined.

"I didn't trust them, and other people were warning me not to do business with them," he told the Times.

Calls placed by The Associated Press to Jim Lorimer, a bodybuilding promoter and co-creator of the Arnold Classic, were not immediately returned.

Bell told SI.com he received the shipment of human chorionic gonadotropin (HCG) last April but said the drug was prescribed "for a medical condition," which he declined to disclose.

More Rocker Dope (NYDN)

By Michael O'keeffe And T.j. Quinn, Daily News Sports Writers

New York Daily News, March 7, 2007

With his career fading fast in 2003, loudmouth pitcher John Rocker of Atlanta Braves and 7-train fame turned to human growth hormone.

His name emerged yesterday in a wide-ranging investigation originating in the Albany County District Attorney's office into a nationwide prescription drug ring in which more than a dozen people have been indicted. His publicist said Rocker admitted taking HGH, now prohibited by Major League Baseball, but insisted he needed the controversial substance for medical reasons.

"That was a growth hormone that was prescribed by a doctor in relation to his rotator cuff surgery in 2003, so I don't really think there is anything to the story," said Debi Curzio, Rocker's publicist.

Human growth hormone, however, is not normally used as post-surgical therapy, numerous medical experts have said.

A Food and Drug Administration spokeswoman told the Daily News that federal rules allow doctors to prescribe growth hormone to treat AIDS wasting, dwarfism and other growth-related issues - but not rotator cuff injuries.

"There are very specific guidelines regarding the use of growth hormones, and tendon healing is not one of them," said Gary Wadler, an adviser to the World Anti-Doping Agency. "The rules are exquisitely specific, and I'm not aware that the Secretary of Health and Human Services has approved the use of growth hormone for tendons."

If Rocker needed the drug, it is unclear why he would have turned to Allied Pharmacy of Mobile, Ala., one of five pharmacies caught up in the alleged Internet steroid and HGH scandal over the last week. Curzio said Rocker's shoulder surgery was performed by Dr. James Andrews, the famed orthopedic surgeon based in Birmingham.

According to a report in Sports Illustrated, Rocker's name was listed among clients of Allied, whose offices were searched by DEA agents in August. According to the report, Rocker received the drug somatropin, a form of growth hormone, in April and July 2003, the same time period in which he was trying to get a job with the Devil Rays.

The names of several athletes, including major leaguers Gary Matthews Jr., David Bell and Jerry Hairston Jr., 1996 Olympic wrestling gold medalist and former WWE star Kurt Angle and boxer Evander Holyfield, have been linked to clinics in Florida, Texas and Alabama that have been raided by authorities. Customers allegedly paid doctors to sign blank prescriptions, which were then submitted over the Internet to pharmacies that provided steroids and human growth hormone. Albany County district attorney David Soares' office led raids on several Florida locations last week, notably Signature Compounding Pharmacy of Orlando.

Meanwhile, two more people were arraigned yesterday in Albany County Court. Steven and Karen Lampert of the Anti-Aging Centers in upstate Nanuet pleaded not guilty and were released without bail. They were charged with submitting prescriptions to a Florida pharmacy for people without medical need. Steven Lampert is charged with 20 counts while his wife was charged with two.

Their indictments also mention Zev Cohen, a Nanuet physician who was apparently a victim in the scheme. Cohen has not been named as a target of the investigation, and in several of the counts against Steven Lampert prosecutors say Lampert forged Cohen's name on prescriptions. A woman at Cohen's office who did not identify herself said, "We're not commenting," and hung up on a reporter.

Rocker earned fame as a fearsome closer with the Atlanta Braves in 1999, and became the player Mets fans loved to hate, but he skyrocketed to infamy with a rant in a January 2000 issue of Sports Illustrated on why he hates New York: "Imagine having to take the 7 Train to the ballpark, looking like you're riding through Beirut next to some kid with purple hair, next to some queer with AIDS, right next to some dude who just got out of jail for the fourth time, right next to some 20-year-old mom with four kids. It's depressing."

He was also quoted making unflattering comments about Asian woman and African Americans, and dismissed the writer of the SI article, Jeff Pearlman, as a "liberal Jew from New York."

Baseball did not specifically ban growth hormone until 2005, and in the absence of a universally accepted test, still does not screen players for it. Rocker would not have been violating any of baseball's rules and is unlikely to face prosecution.

Rocker made two appearances with Tampa Bay in 2003, and then tried one last unsuccessful comeback with the independent Long Island Ducks in 2005. He was last seen on the cable TV circuit hawking shirts that said "Speak English," saying it was his effort to preserve American culture.

Curzio said Rocker did not take growth hormone long enough to enhance his performance.

"John is not worried about this at all," she said.

Inside The Steroid Sting (SI)

SI.com, March 7, 2007

The Palm Beach Rejuvenation Center is decidedly less exotic than its name might suggest. Wedged between a lawyer's office and a brokerage firm on the third floor of a dreary Jupiter, Fla., office building, it is a glorified boiler room, "basically a call center," as one employee explains. Yet investigators contend that the Palm Beach Rejuvenation Center (PBRC) -- and dozens of so-called antiaging or wellness centers like it -- is a vital component in a massive illegal distribution network that enabled customers to place orders over the Internet for performance-enhancing drugs, including steroids and human growth hormone (HGH).

"This is the newest frontier," says Christopher Baynes, a prosecutor in New York's Albany County, whose office initiated the investigation three years ago. "The guy with the black bag at the gym now has his own website."

On Feb. 27, SI accompanied investigators from multiple law-enforcement agencies (box right) on a raid of PBRC. Simultaneously, agents in Orlando were raiding Signature Pharmacy, a compounding pharmacy that last year did more than $40

million in sales, much of it with PBRC. On Monday, PBRC co-owner Glen Stefano and 10 others pleaded not guilty to multiple charges during arraignment proceedings in Albany. Stefano was charged with illegally selling steroids and hormones. Earlier, Signature owners Robert Loomis and his wife, Naomi, were charged with criminal diversion of prescription medications, criminal sale of a controlled substance and insurance fraud.

It will take weeks, months perhaps, for authorities to sift through the client lists, hard drives, invoices and trash from Dumpsters that were seized in the raids -- more than a ton of documents was confiscated. And when they're through, investigators believe they'll unearth the names of hundreds, even thousands of clients who have received a wide array of drugs; and that list is likely to include prominent athletes.

Just consider the fruits of a similar Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) raid last year, code-named Operation Netroids. On Aug. 29, agents converged on Applied Pharmacy Services, a compounding pharmacy in Mobile. (A compounding pharmacy makes its own drugs generically.) Seized client records revealed the names of more than 20 athletes in a variety of sports who received drugs from Applied Pharmacy. A 37-page classified intelligence report reviewed by SI alleges that, among athletes:

· Outfielder Gary Matthews Jr., whose career year with the Texas Rangers in 2006 earned him a five-year, $50 million free-agent deal with the Los Angeles Angels, was sent Genotropin in 2004. The prescription was written by a doctor at a now-defunct antiaging clinic in Florida. (Through his agent, Matthews declined comment, but the lawyer who represents the outfielder said last Saturday that Matthews has not broken any laws and would cooperate with the investigation.)

Kurt Angle, a 1996 Olympic gold-medal-winning freestyle wrestler and now a star professional wrestler, received two prescriptions for trenbolone and one for nandrolone between October 2004 and February '05. (Angle did not return messages left with his spokesman.)

· Rangers outfielder Jerry Hairston Jr. received Genotropin, human chorionic gonadotropin (HCG) and Clomiphene Citrate in 2004. One of Hairston's prescriptions was written by "A. Almarashi." Investigators believe Almarashi is an alias for a Queens, N.Y., doctor stripped of her medical license in 1999. She is awaiting trial on multiple charges after allegedly writing bogus prescriptions for thousands of online customers she never examined. (Hairston, a third-generation major leaguer, emphatically denied any connection. "Not one time have I taken steroids or anything like that," he said last Thursday. "I would never do anything like that to jeopardize my career or my family's name.")

· In June 2004 a patient named Evan Fields picked up three vials of testosterone and related injection supplies from a Columbus, Ga., doctor, traced through Applied. Later that month Fields also obtained five vials of Saizen and three months later returned for treatment of hypogonadism, a condition whereby sex glands produce little or no hormones. Investigators noted that Fields shares both the birth date and home address of former heavyweight champion Evander Holyfield. What's more, when SI called a phone number on a Post-It note attached to the Fields patient file, Holyfield answered. (Holyfield, who at 44 continues to fight professionally, told SI that he knew nothing of the drugs. Through Main Events, the promotional company that represents him, he released a statement denying any steroid use.)

· David Bell, a veteran of a dozen major league seasons, received six packages of HCG at a Philadelphia address last April, when he played for the Phillies. The cost was $128.80, and the drug was prescribed in conjunction with an Arizona antiaging facility. Bell acknowledges receiving the shipment but tells SI the drug was prescribed to him "for a medical condition," which he declined to disclose, citing his right to privacy.

· Jose Canseco, the retired major leaguer and an admitted steroid user, received somatropin, testosterone, stanozolol and HCG, as well as 340 syringes, in 2004. The shipment to his California residence was arranged through the same defunct antiaging clinic that Matthews allegedly patronized. (Canseco did not return calls seeking comment.)

No birth date was indicated on the prescriptions, but according to the Applied database, former Atlanta Braves reliever John Rocker received two prescriptions for somatropin between April and July 2003. (Through his spokeswoman, Rocker denied any knowledge of the prescription and denied ever receiving a banned substance.)

Sources tell SI that the clients appearing on invoices and customer lists are unlikely to face prosecution, because the targets of the raids and investigations are the members of the network of suppliers. "Our focus here is to shut down distribution channels," says Albany County district attorney David Soares, one of the leaders of the investigation. And because the reports only allege receipt (and in some cases, purchase) of the banned drugs -- not usage -- the athletes are unlikely to face disciplinary action from their respective leagues or governing bodies. (Major League Baseball didn't add HGH to its list of banned substances until 2005.) Still, the information offers a clear and chilling glimpse into just how easily banned substances, including steroids and HGH, can be obtained by anyone, of any age, who possesses Internet access and a credit card.

The origins of this wide-scale, multi-agency investigation can be traced to upstate New York. In the fall of 2004 state narcotics investigators based in Albany noticed that a local doctor, David Stephenson, was running a website, docstat.com, and was purchasing massive quantities of a variety of drugs, including narcotics and steroids. According to authorities, Applied was his chief supplier. After receiving the drugs at his residence, Stephenson repackaged them and resold them to "patients" who

DOJ_NMG_0141531

had visited his website. One investigator placed an order through docstat.com, claiming to be an overweight pilot with a heroin addiction and a drinking problem. As part of a questionnaire offered when registering on the site, clients were asked the reason they were seeking particular drugs. The investigator responded that he needed prescriptions for hydrocodone, methadone, nandrolone, Ritalin and testosterone because "I want to get high to fly." Within days the drugs arrived by way of express mail.

In the summer of 2005 Stephenson pleaded guilty to felony criminal sale of a controlled substance; he is serving a six-year jail sentence. The Stephenson case, however, stood for much more than a rogue doctor abusing his license. Studying the chain of supply, agents from Albany County were able to lay bare a drug pipeline that marries the power of the Internet with spurious antiaging centers, board-certified compounding pharmacies and venal doctors. Soon, the agents shared their findings with federal and state authorities across the country.

As Mark Haskins, a senior investigator for New York State's Bureau of Narcotic Enforcement, explains it, "Basically you have an antiaging clinic with an Internet presence. [Clinic operators] put the product on the Internet. The customer finds them online, fills out a brief questionnaire and requests steroids, hormone therapy, whatever. Someone from the clinic contacts the customer and then develops a prescription for the steroid treatment or hormone treatment. Then [the clinic] sends or e-mails the prescription to a doctor, who is often not even in the same state. He'll sign it [because] he's being paid by the clinic, usually $20 to $50 for every signature. The signed prescriptions get faxed to the compounding pharmacies, which know from the very beginning that there is no doctor-patient relationship. The pharmacy then sends the product to the customer."

Last spring, during a raid on his Scottsdale, Ariz., home, Jason Grimsley, then a pitcher for the Arizona Diamondbacks, admitted to using HGH, steroids and amphetamines. In an affidavit he explained to investigators that another major leaguer, later identified as former first baseman David Segui, "told [me] of a doctor in Florida that he was using at a 'wellness center' to obtain human growth hormone."

"It makes total sense for athletes to do it this way," says agent Alex Wright of Florida's Metropolitan Bureau of Investigation. "If they get caught, they can say, 'I sent my blood work to the clinic like [it] asked me, and the doctor said my [testosterone] levels are low.' This is the best way they can get stuff. They have the comfort of anonymity because there is no face-to-face. They are just a name and a credit card."

In addition to exposing the architecture of the distribution ring, the ongoing investigations appear to confirm what doping experts have suspected for years: HGH is a popular drug among athletes. A synthetic hormone, HGH is thought by some to accelerate recovery times, speed healing, decrease body fat and, particularly when combined with steroids, increase muscle mass and therefore strength.

HGH can be prescribed by doctors for legitimate medical purposes. Historically, this has meant combating rare pituitary disease and treating patients with progressively debilitating conditions resulting from AIDS and some forms of cancer. Yet lately some doctors have ascribed a liberal definition to "legitimate medical purposes," contending that aging is, in effect, a progressively debilitating disease and that any patients with diminishing hormone levels are eligible for the drug. The American Academy of Anti-Aging Medicine, a Chicago-based group that supports using HGH to replace growth hormone as its levels decline with age, counts more than 10,000 health-care practitioners among its members. This "off-label," or unorthodox, use of HGH is the source of significant controversy in the medical community. "It's a ruse," says Dr. Thomas Perls, an associate professor at Boston University School of Medicine, who maintains the website antiagingquackery.com. "The public has equated hormones with youth, and HGH is the drug of choice for these hucksters to push." (Through a spokesman the academy said in a statement to SI that Perls's comment "is on the level of that of a 'flat earth society' uninformed person.")

The risks of HGH use are abundant, including diabetes, muscle and joint pain, hypertension, carpal tunnel syndrome, abnormal enlargement of organs and advancement of cardiovascular diseases. Some researchers believe HGH can accelerate cancer. "The issue is pretty straightforward," says Mark Schutta, a University of Pennsylvania endocrinologist. "You're giving people a hormone that can potentially increase the growth of abnormal cells." Schutta also notes that the American College of Endocrinology does not recommend using HGH to treat adults except in the exceedingly rare instance that a patient produces no growth hormone naturally.

Regardless, HGH has found favor among athletes. "Of all the things out there, certainly synthetic human growth hormone is way at the top of the list," says Dr. Gary Wadler, a New York University associate professor of medicine and a World Anti-Doping Agency member. "What athletes have [tried to do] is make muscles bigger with HGH and then make those big muscles stronger by adding steroids to the mix."

Another factor contributing to HGH's popularity: Leagues that ban it don't test for it. There is only one effective test for HGH detection, and it involves a blood sample. Unions in most major sports have been unwilling to subject their players to blood work, deeming it a physical intrusion. As NFL Players Association executive director Gene Upshaw recently put it, "I'm still not willing to have our players stuck like a pin cushion."

DOJ_NMG_0141532

In perhaps the biggest doping scandal in NFL history, a South Carolina doctor, James Shortt, distributed HGH and steroids to members of the Carolina Panthers' 2003 Super Bowl team, including three of the five starting offensive linemen. (Shortt admitted guilt and is serving a 366-day sentence.) Last fall, on the HBO show Costas Now, former NFL defensive tackle Dana Stubblefield said he believes 30% of the league's players use HGH. NFL officials have often expressed concern about HGH, and the league recently pledged $500,000 to help develop a reliable HGH test.

That is why investigators were particularly curious when they noticed that a University of Pittsburgh Medical Center-affiliated internist, Richard Rydze, had used a credit card from his private practice to purchase more than $150,000 worth of HGH from Signature Pharmacy. Since the mid-1980s Rydze has been an associate team physician for the Pittsburgh Steelers. Questioned by SI, Rydze did not deny making the purchases, but he asserted that he uses the HGH to treat elderly patients who are "deficient in growth hormone" and require tendon repair. "[It's] not for athletes -- never," says Rydze. "I don't give it to people who want to come in here and look pretty and look young and build up their muscles. I will not do that."

According to Rydze, he dispenses HGH to "35 or 40" patients referred to him by other physicians, including the Steelers' orthopedist. (The orthopedist declined comment.) Rydze says that he treats these patients, including retired football players, early in the morning -- "mainly in my spare time" -- and that these patients tend to "cycle through" every three or four months. "We monitor their levels, and then they're gone, back to their own doctors," says Rydze, 56, who won the silver medal in platform diving at the 1972 Olympics. He also says that he ordered the HGH through Signature to save money. (In the wake of this revelation, the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center says it is conducting an internal investigation of Rydze.)

One might assert that at the very least, it shows questionable judgment for an NFL team doctor to purchase $150,000 of HGH -- approximate street value: as much as $1 million -- at a time when drug issues are in the league's crosshairs and the Shortt scandal remains a public relations scar. Rydze, however, asserts he has his team's full support. "The Rooneys [the Steelers' owners] are aware that I do this," he says. "I mean, they have my trust that I would never do this with an athlete." (Steelers president Art Rooney II declined to address Rydze's specific characterization, but he released a statement that read in part, "There is no evidence Dr. Rydze prescribed or provided any hormone treatments to any of our players [and he] has assured me that this has never happened and will never happen.")

If the list of implicated sports stars and teams has already turned the investigation into a cause célèbre, investigators are haunted by how many "nonfamous" athletes have been implicated in the sweeps. In the coming weeks authorities will seek answers to why, for instance, Signature sold performance-enhancing drugs to a teenage in-line skating champion. Or why facilities offering antiaging treatment are servicing so many clients born in the 1990s, some of them still in puberty. "Kids are watching ESPN or reading Sports Illustrated and making every effort to gain a competitive edge," says Soares, the Albany County DA. "That we have steroids and human growth hormone so readily available presents a clear and present danger."

At last week's raid of the Palm Beach Rejuvenation Center, a string of strikingly muscular, strikingly young employees filed out, somber expressions etched on their faces. Inside, authorities questioned executives, including Joseph Raich, listed on a government document as a company director. Raich, 44, is well-known in the South Florida youth wrestling community. He has provided financial assistance to aspiring Olympians, and before the Athens Games in the summer of 2004, he sponsored a training camp in South Florida for the U.S. Olympic wrestling team. The Florida Amateur Wrestling Association website even lists Raich (who did not return repeated messages seeking comment) as the contact for the Wrestling Club of the Palm Beaches. The listing also provides his e-mail address: Joehghtest.com.

More Names Surface As Steroid Story Widens (USAT)

By Bob Nightengale, USA TODAY

USA Today, March 7, 2007

SCOTTSDALE, Ariz. — Free agent infielder David Bell, who played 12 seasons, became the latest son of a major league player to allegedly receive performance-enhancing drugs in the mail, according to documents obtained by SI.com.

Bell, the son of Kansas City Royals manager Buddy Bell, received six packages of a human growth hormone at his Philadelphia home last April when playing for the Phillies, SI.com reported, citing a 37-page classified intelligence report as part of a federal, state and local investigation into the illegal sale of steroids.

Bell confirmed he received the shipment but told SI.com it was prescribed for a "medical condition."

Former reliever John Rocker was also named in the SI.com report, alleging he received steroids from an Alabama pharmacy. Rocker denied knowledge of the prescription and said he never received any banned substances.

However, Rocker's publicist, Debi Curzio, told the New York Daily News that Rocker admitted taking HGH, now banned by Major League Baseball, but said it was prescribed by a doctor in relation to his rotator cuff surgery in 2003.

In addition, SI.com reported wrestler Kurt Angle, who won a gold medal in the 1996 Olympics, appeared on a client list of Applied Pharmacy, a Mobile, Ala., company raided in the investigation into the illegal sale of steroids.

Bell joins Los Angeles Angels center fielder Gary Matthews Jr. (the son of former major leaguer Gary "Sarge" Matthews) and Texas Rangers infielder Jerry Hairston (the son of former major leaguer Jerry Hairston) as receiving illegal performance-enhancing drugs, according to SI.com.

Hairston has emphatically denied taking steroids or illegal performance-enhancing drugs, telling reporters last week, "I have never in my life — never — used steroids or illegal substances."

While Matthews has refused to comment directly on the allegations, Angels owner Arte Moreno wants answers. "My expectations were that he would make a statement," Moreno told The Arizona Republic. "I'm very disappointed."

Robert Shapiro, Matthews' attorney, issued a statement that said Matthews has not broken any laws or baseball rules and advised him not to speak on the matter.

Olympic Booster Tied To Clinic In Drug Inquiry (NYT)

By Duff Wilson And Serge F. Kovaleski

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

JUPITER, Fla., — A businessman and wrestling booster who has sponsored Olympic and school-age athletes is under investigation by state and federal authorities examining the distribution of steroids and human growth hormone, according to a law enforcement official familiar with the case.

The booster, Joseph L. Raich, is the vice president of Palm Beach Rejuvenation Center, a business here offering hormone and antiaging treatments. The center was described as a nexus of illegal drug activity in charges filed Monday against the company's president and medical director.

Mr. Raich was not charged, but the authorities seized steroid and human growth hormone supplies from his desk last week, according to a Florida Department of Law Enforcement document. And he continues to be under investigation over possible involvement with bogus prescriptions or illegal distribution, the law enforcement official said Tuesday.

He added that Mr. Raich had been talking with investigators.

Mr. Raich, 44, is well known here for having sponsored the 2004 United States Olympic freestyle wrestling team, allowing members to stay at his home and to use local training facilities during a week that June, two months before the Athens Olympics. The 9,000-square-foot home has a pool and personal chef.

Mr. Raich is also active in youth wrestling. Last year, Jupiter Christian School became the smallest school in Florida history to win a state team championship in the sport. Three members of the team, including two individual state champions, came from the Raich family. The Raiches also sponsor an annual wrestling tournament at the school.

Mr. Raich and Jupiter Christian school officials declined to comment Tuesday. No one has accused any of the wrestlers for the school or the Olympic squad of using performance-enhancing drugs.

Kevin Jackson, the national freestyle wrestling coach, said in a telephone interview that the team's trip to Florida, including its placement in Mr. Raich's home, was arranged by the Palm Beach County Community Olympic Development Program. That program was recognized by the United States Olympic Committee but is now defunct.

"We knew that he was involved in some kind of medical center or rehabilitation center," Mr. Jackson said. "But we had no idea that he may have been doing some of the things that have just been made public."

Darryl Seibel, a spokesman for the U.S.O.C., said, "Without prejudging anyone's guilt or innocence, we had no knowledge at all about any business activities Mr. Raich may have been involved in."

In a telephone interview, Gary Abbott, the director of communications for USA Wrestling, which is partly financed and affiliated with the U.S.O.C., said of Mr. Raich, "To be honest with you, I think we only know him as a wrestling leader in Florida, and we are not aware of his business dealings."

The Olympic practice sessions were held in the John Raich Wrestling Room at Cardinal Newman High School. The room was named after Joseph Raich's brother John, a 1983 Florida state wrestling champion who, according to USA Wrestling's Web site, was killed in a boating accident after his senior year of high school.

Joseph Raich is also a real estate developer and an investor in addition to working at the center. He had offices there until it closed after a raid by law enforcement authorities Feb. 27. (A satellite clinic in Palm Beach Gardens remained open.) The investigation, led in part by the Albany County district attorney because of tough drug laws in New York, is focusing on distributors of the drugs and the doctors who falsify prescriptions, not on users. So far, 13 people have been charged.

Authorities, acting under a sealed search warrant, seized steroids, growth hormone, syringes and business records, including Mr. Raich's tax records, during the search of the rejuvenation center offices, according to a receipt of the items seized in the search that was filed with the court.

From Mr. Raich's desk specifically, they reported seizing 13 Genotropin MiniQuicks, a growth hormone in a cartridge designed for easy attachment to needles to inject; one Norditropin growth hormone product made by Norvo Nordisk that

DOJ_NMG_0141534

advertises the ability to remain potent without being refrigerated; and one full bottle of Ultratest 250, a combination of anabolic steroids.

Mr. Raich's office had also been used as headquarters of the Wrestling Club of the Palm Beaches Inc., a nonprofit group that promotes youth wrestling. Mr. Raich was a co-founder of the club with high school coaches and others in March 2003. It is listed on the Florida Amateur Wrestling Association's Web site as a chartered club of USA Wrestling. The wrestling association describes itself as the official organization representing USA Wrestling in Florida.

Robert Kamperman, an association board member, said that Mr. Raich had not been involved with the group for more than two years.

"There were differences in opinions between Raich and the board over the direction of the association," he said. "Raich and a group of others put forward a proposal to assume total responsibility for all our Florida national teams. But the offer was turned down by the board."

Mr. Raich listed his e-mail address as joe@hghtest.com in a listing for the Wrestling Club of the Palm Beaches on a Web directory kept by the Florida Amateur Wrestling Association. He identified himself as the head coach of the wrestling club.

Also part of the same complex of offices is a company called RXHGH Inc., which was founded in April 2003 by Mr. Raich along with Glen Stefanos, who is also the president of the rejuvenation center. (His name was spelled Stefanos in criminal filings but Stephanos in business filings.)

Mr. Stefanos; his brother George Stefanos; and the center's medical director, Dr. Robert Carlson, were charged Monday in Albany County with seven counts of criminal sale of prescriptions and controlled substances. They all pleaded not guilty.

Dr. Carlson's criminal defense lawyer, Charles R. Holloman of Ocala, Fla., said Dr. Carlson did nothing intentionally wrong and had been advised that his prescribing practices were legal.

Other tenants in the office building said the rejuvenation center was raided by federal agents about one year ago, but reopened the next day.

Steroids and human growth hormone are widely used by body builders and other athletes seeking a chemical boost in strength and power. Their side effects may include joint pain, diabetes and increased risk of cancer. They are illegal without a prescription. The drugs are also increasingly promoted as a cure for a host of age-related ills, although distributing or prescribing them that way is illegal.

A posting on Craigslist in Miami on Feb. 16 had a title of "Human Growth Hormone — The Fountain of Youth Is Available to You," and a listing of Brianna Raich. She included her e-mail address and identified herself as an assistant sales representative for Palm Beach Rejuvenation Center. It is unclear what her relationship is to Joseph Raich.

"We are one of the leading suppliers of Human Growth Hormone, which has been called 'The Fountain of Youth,' " Brianna Raich wrote. "The effects of using HGH are remarkable and unfortunately I cannot list them all on this page. A few to name are increased muscle mass, decrease in fat percentage, women say bye to cellulite, increased energy, stamina, improvement in skin, etc. etc."

Brianna Raich, 20, did not respond to e-mail and telephone messages.

TV Exercise Beauty Caught In Drug 'Net (NYDN)

By John Marzulli, Jose Martinez, And Bill Hutchinson Daily News Staff Writers

New York Daily News, March 6, 2007

A sexy TV aerobics guru and her wealthy boyfriend have been busted for pushing more than pushups on the Internet, authorities charged yesterday.

Blond beauty Sonia Barrantes Molina, 29, and Miami businessman Anthony Quiñones, 46, were portrayed by federal prosecutors as Internet prescription drug dealers.

The couple and seven Puerto Rican doctors were rounded up by Drug Enforcement Administration agents in a ring-crushing sting called Operation Click 4 Drugs.

Molina pleaded not guilty yesterday in Brooklyn Federal Court to charges of money laundering and distributing prescription drugs on the Internet.

Prosecutors claim the ring made millions of dollars between January 2004 and December 2006, and laundered the ill-gotten gains by buying real estate and fancy cars.

The feds are seeking to seize $4.2million in assets belonging to Quiñones, including a Florida condo, a 2007 Mercedes and a Ferrari Spyder.

Customers would complete a questionnaire on the ring's Web site, Doctorsonline.com, and one of the Puerto Rican doctors would write the prescription without ever consulting with the patient, officials said.

DOJ_NMG_0141535

The customers would then pick up their prescriptions, including powerful painkillers like hydrocodone, at pharmacies, including some in the New York area, officials said.

Federal officials smashed the ring after learning Molina was allegedly scouting out property in Costa Rica to move their base of operations.

Molina was being held without bail last night. She faces five years in prison if convicted. Quiñones remained jailed in Florida.

Defense attorney Humberto Dominguez of Florida said Molina is upset, shocked and eager to fight the charges.

"She never thought she'd get arrested because she's only tangentially involved, if anything," Dominguez said.

Molina started out as an 18-year-old TV news reporter in Costa Rica before transforming herself into a workout wonder woman.

Besides her TV career, Molina owns three beauty salons and a tattoo and body-piercing parlor in Costa Rica.

In a 2003 interview, she boasted that she "admires with pride every centimeter of her toned body."

Surgeon General Calls On U.S. To Tackle Underage Drinking (AP)

AP, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON — Americans need a wake-up call about the widespread use of alcohol by millions of underage drinkers, acting Surgeon General Kenneth Moritsugu said Tuesday.

Moritsugu issued a report that he said was designed to get all sectors of society involved in solving a major health problem. He described alcohol as the drug of choice for teens.

The 2005 National Survey on Drug Use and Health estimates there are 11 million underage drinkers in the United States. Nearly 7.2 million are considered binge drinkers, typically meaning they drank more than five drinks on occasion.

"Alcohol remains the most heavily abused substance by America's youth," Moritsugu said. He said the report calls for a "change in the culture and attitudes toward drinking in America. We can no longer ignore what alcohol is doing to our children."

Moritsugu urged more research on adolescent alcohol use and its relationship to physical and mental development. He said there is new research that indicates alcohol may harm the development of the brain in adolescents.

Although there has been a significant decline in tobacco and illicit drug use among teens, underage drinking has remained at consistently high levels, he said. In part, that high use stems from tolerance by adults.

"Too many Americans consider underage drinking a rite of passage to adulthood," said Moritsugu. "Research shows that young people who start drinking before the age of 15 are five times more likely to have alcohol-related problems later in life."

TAX:

Former West Palm Beach Official To Plead Guilty To Tax Charge (FLSUNSEN)

By Sally Apgar, South Florida Sun-Sentinel

South Florida Sun-Sentinel, March 7, 2007

Former City Commissioner James Exline is expected to plead guilty this morning in U.S. District Court to knowingly filing a false federal tax return.

Prosecutors said Exline, 42, took a $50,000 payment from a developer in 2004 and did not report it on his return.

According to the charging document, the unnamed developer retained Exline in October 2004 for "land planning services" on property that the developer wanted to develop. The payment was "for past and future real estate commissions and for land planning services."

To hide the money trail, prosecutors said, Exline directed the developer to write a personal check for $50,000 to a West Palm Beach jewelry store owner who gave him the money.

Exline faces three years in prison and fines of up to $250,000.

Exline, reached at his business, Urban Land Consulting, declined to comment.

At a news conference Tuesday afternoon to announce the charges, U. S. Attorney Alexander Acosta said: "County and city commissioners are not above the law. Commissioner Exline had an obligation to report all his income and to pay his fair share of taxes, just like those individuals he represented.

"We cannot tolerate misconduct or corruption from our public officials, and we in the U.S. Attorney's Office will continue to pursue those matters aggressively."

DOJ_NMG_0141536

According to city records, Exline and the rest of the commission voted unanimously on March 29, 2004, to annex 9 acres of land owned by developer John Sansbury, a former county administrator, on the south side of Okeechobee Boulevard near Golden Lakes Boulevard just west of Florida's Turnpike.

The charging document said Exline was not in the develx oper's hire until seven months later, in October 2004. As a result, his vote on the annexation was not considered in making any criminal charges.

Exline's attorney, Robert Gershman, said the relationship with Sansbury "did not affect or influence any of his [Exline's] votes on the commission."

"Jim is not wealthy and did not make any great wealth off this. His only assets are a home and car. It's not like he's got offshore bank accounts," Gershman said.

Sansbury could not be reached for comment despite phone calls to his home and real estate office.

Prosecutors said that after the developer hired Exline, the commissioner met with city staff "to assist the land developer with the land use and planning issues pending" with the city. On May 11, 2005, city staff, after talks with Exline, approved a subdivision that allowed Sansbury to build a restaurant overlooking a retention pond.

Acosta said yesterday that while Exline met with city planners from October 2004 through May 2005 to discuss land issues, he never disclosed his financial relationship with Sansbury.

"We expect the politicians we vote into office to abide by the same rules as ordinary citizens," said Jonathan Solomon, FBI special agent in charge of the case. He added: "Exline made up his own rules, for his own benefit and with that decision, his integrity vanished."

Exline, a former city planner who was first appointed to his seat in 1999, has been cooperating since June with state and federal prosecutors, according to Gershman.

Gershman has said his client will plead guilty today.

He said Exline paid about $16,000 in taxes on the $50,000 to the IRS last May. Exline then hired Gershman and together they approached prosecutors with "the intent to resign" from the city commission. Instead, federal and state prosecutors wanted the commissioner to keep his job for seven more months.

Gershman would not confirm that Exline wore wires for prosecutors when he attended certain meetings. Gershman did say that information from Exline is feeding ongoing federal and state investigations of "other individuals."

Exline resigned from the commission, at the instruction of prosecutors, on Jan. 19.

Gershman said that at Exline's sentencing he expects "the IRS to say that they are whole so he won't need to pay any kind of restitution or debt."

The federal tax charge against Exline stems from a state grand jury investigation into possible "pay-to-play" corruption within city government and conflicts of interest among city officials. Earlier this month, the grand jury released a report that found no criminal charges but said there was a "perception" of a pay-to-play culture in which developers make campaign contributions believing it will move their projects forward.

Exline is the second city commissioner forced to resign and face federal charges. In May, former Commissioner Ray Liberti, 60, pleaded guilty to federal charges of mail fraud and obstruction of justice in a case that triggered the grand jury's wider corruption investigation.

Prosecutors accused Liberti of using his city position to cite the West Palm Beach owners of a nightclub and massage parlor for code violations as a way to intimidate them into selling their businesses at a discount to buyers he had chosen.

Sally Apgar can be reached at sapgar@sun-sentinel.com or 561-228-5506

States Move To Close Tax Shelter That Benefits Wal-Mart, Others (WSJ)

By Jesse Drucker

The Wall Street Journal, March 7, 2007

State officials in Maryland and Connecticut said they would take measures to close a popular state corporate income-tax shelter used by companies including Wal-Mart Stores Inc.

Maryland State Comptroller Peter Franchot announced that the state would no longer let payments to so-called captive real-estate investment trusts be deducted from state corporate taxable income. Meanwhile, Connecticut Attorney General Richard Blumenthal said in an interview that his office has begun investigating the use of captive REITs for tax avoidance purposes.

In both states, officials said the moves were prompted by a page-one article1 in The Wall Street Journal last month that detailed how Wal-Mart and others have used the structure to lower their state tax burdens.

DOJ_NMG_0141537

"It is our policy to comply with all the laws in every state in which Wal-Mart does business and these are lawful structures," said John Simley, a Wal-Mart spokesman. "Even without the tax benefits, there are compelling reasons to use this type of structure creating a separate vehicle solely to manage real estate and administer capital requirements."

The complicated structure takes advantage of a state tax loophole that works as follows: Wal-Mart transferred hundreds of its stores to a real-estate investment trust, or REIT, of which it owned 99%. It then paid tax-deductible rent to the REIT to use those stores. By effectively funneling those rental payments through a Delaware subsidiary that owned the REIT, Wal-Mart was able to recoup the rent money.

The result: Wal-Mart turned rental payments to itself into state-deductible expenses, even though the money never left the company.

Over one four-year period, the Journal estimated, the structure led to a net tax savings of about $230 million for the giant retailer. Wal-Mart is in litigation over its use of the REIT with the state of North Carolina over approximately $33 million in disputed back taxes, interest and penalties.

Other companies that have used such captive REITs to cut their taxes include AutoZone Inc., two units of Bank of America Corp. and a unit of Regions Financial Corp.

Maryland's Mr. Franchot said his office would begin auditing companies that it suspected of using this arrangement and would disallow the deduction if it found such payments. In Maryland, the comptroller's office performs regular state tax audits of corporations. Mr. Franchot said the agency would be able to examine three years of past returns, and he estimated that the move would bring the state "tens of millions of dollars" a year in added tax payments.

In Connecticut, the attorney general's office represents the state in major tax litigation but can't perform tax audits. However, Mr. Blumenthal said his office has "reached out to our Department of Revenue Services to work with us."

Write to Jesse Drucker at jesse.drucker@wsj.com2

Powerful Governor Stands His Ground, Again, On Food Tax (NYT)

By Adam Nossiter

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

JACKSON, Miss., March 1 — The shoppers at the no-frills Brookshire's supermarket — plate lunches $4.49, food stamps gladly accepted — have no doubt: swapping the nation's highest state grocery tax for one of its lowest cigarette taxes is an excellent idea, and fie on the governor who opposes it.

"Oh, yeah, no doubt about it, they need to put it off the food," said Reggie Funchess, a worker at the BASF plant. "It's something that will help the people. Politicians, they must have a treasure chest somewhere."

Up at the stately domed Mississippi Capitol, Gov. Haley Barbour, a former tobacco lobbyist, has other ideas. Studies, polls, protests at the Capitol, legislative sentiment and America's highest cardiovascular disease rate notwithstanding, the governor of the poorest state is not budging, for the second year in a row: no cut in the 7 percent grocery tax and no increase in the 18-cents-a-pack third-lowest-in-the-nation, cigarette tax.

Mr. Barbour, the former Republican National Committee chairman and big-time Washington lobbyist whose clients included the five major tobacco companies, is a busy man these days, and a powerful governor.

Basking at home in the reflection of his national image as the post-Hurricane Katrina success story among governors, having last week scored a giant automobile plant for his state and considered a shoo-in for re-election this year, Mr. Barbour faces few opponents, legislators say. He pushed through the Legislature hundreds of millions in subsidies for the plant, for Toyota S.U.V.s, three days after announcing it.

Mr. Barbour, the lawmakers say, is getting used to getting his way and is likely to do so on the doomed groceries-for-cigarettes tax swap.

"Can we talk about it some other time?" the governor asked as he bustled down a marble corridor to an appointment and as an aide cut in that "the governor wasn't going to be able to talk about this today."

And so it is that a bill to increase the cigarette tax to $1 a pack and cut the grocery tax in half overwhelmingly passed in the Mississippi House last month, remains bottled up in the State Senate Finance Committee, which is friendly to Mr. Barbour. Other poor states — Arkansas, South Carolina and Utah — have moved to cut their sales taxes on groceries. Not Mississippi.

"There's no doubt he would veto this bill," said the committee chairman, State Senator Tommy Robertson, a Republican. And he could do so without fearing an override, Mr. Robertson said.

That, to some, is a true measure of Mr. Barbour's power. He need not worry about political fallout from rejecting what is, in most reckonings, a popular initiative.

"It's an indication of how much influence he has, because he can take something we know is good — the best bill passed in the Legislature in the last 30 years — and he can say it's bad," said State Representative Percy W. Watson, the chairman of

DOJ_NMG_0141538

the Ways and Means Committee and a Democrat. "Politics has entered the process, and there is some effort to protect the tobacco companies."

Another Democrat, State Senator Hob Bryan, added, "It would have been the law already were it not for the governor's absolute determination not to raise the tax on tobacco."

The governor's aides and allies say Mr. Barbour is simply sticking to his no-new-taxes promise. "The governor ran four years ago on, 'I'm not going to raise anybody's taxes,' and he hasn't," Mr. Robertson said.

But others, including health officials, say the dichotomy is false. The governor's no-tax pledge, they insist, is at odds with the public good, since most studies show that increasing the cost of cigarettes sharply diminishes the number of smokers.

"We have the worst health indices in almost every category of any state in the country," said Dr. J. Edward Hill, the immediate past president of the American Medical Association and a physician in Tupelo. "Reducing the percentage of citizens who smoke and increasing funding from cigarettes would have tremendous advantages."

Dr. Hill said the issue had become entangled in political ideology. "It's political so-called principle — 'I'm never going to raise taxes on anything' — which is actually also relatively stupid," Dr. Hill said.

Mississippi is the fourth-highest state in deaths attributed to smoking. And it is one of three states that give no grocery-tax break to lower-income families, according to a study by the John C. Stennis Institute of Government at the Mississippi State University.

In the Brookshire's parking lot, in working-class southern Jackson, shoppers toting their few bags had no trouble coming up with uses for the extra hundreds of dollars from a tax cut. Most of the buying around here is done on the first of the month — payday, explained a store official, and expenditures are made frugally.

"My children's needs, household stuff," said Shameka Bouie, a mother of four whose truck driver cigarette-smoking husband is "always complaining" that his habit is more expensive outside Mississippi.

Howard McBound, a police officer with the Veterans Affairs Department, said: "Groceries are what we live on. My light bill is going up. My gas bill is going up. You can raise the price of cigarettes, people will still smoke."

Even some conservative Republicans disagree with Mr. Barbour. "The cigarette tax and the grocery tax are both public health issues," said one, State Senator Alan Nunnelee. And the tax on groceries, Mr. Nunnelee said, "is just the most cruel tax any government can impose."

What To Know When Choosing A Tax Preparer (WSJ)

The Wall Street Journal, March 7, 2007

Finding a good tax preparer has never been easy. But the growing complexity of the tax code has made it even trickier.

More than 60% of all taxpayers used paid preparers last year, up from 46% in the mid-1980s. Many more are likely to need professional help next year unless Congress does something to curb the rapid growth of the alternative minimum tax, a highly complex parallel tax system that ensnared about 3.5 million people last year.

Nobody knows for sure how many paid preparers there are. Cono Namorato, a former Internal Revenue Service official who now is a partner at Caplin & Drysdale in Washington, estimates there are 1.2 million to 1.6 million. Among them are highly trained tax lawyers, certified public accountants and enrolled agents -- who are private-sector specialists licensed to practice before the IRS. The list also includes seasonal workers at national tax-preparation companies, as well as small storefront and shopping-mall operations.

Yet relying on even the most experienced tax pro is no guarantee of getting a bulletproof return -- or even saving money. Indeed, armed with a good software program, you may well be able to do your taxes on your own.

In some cases, preparers make very basic errors that can cost their clients money. For example, the IRS says millions of people who hired someone else this year to do their returns for 2006 neglected to claim a special new telephone excise-tax refund.

Lawmakers are considering legislation to expand regulation of the tax-preparation industry. Some senators have proposed requiring paid preparers to meet training and competency standards. They also want to make it easier for the IRS to crack down on wrongdoers.

Concern about paid preparers escalated last year after the U.S. Government Accountability Office found significant mistakes -- and even some cheating -- by workers at a few major tax-preparation firms. (The firms weren't identified.) Adding to those concerns, earlier this year the IRS discovered large numbers of bogus claims for the phone-tax refund. Many of those were on returns filed by paid preparers.

The IRS also recently warned taxpayers to beware of dishonest preparers. Among the most obvious red flags: Preparers who refuse to sign your return, who assure you that they will get you a higher refund than anyone else, or who calculate their fees as a percentage of your refund amount.

DOJ_NMG_0141539

So how do you find the right preparer, should you decide you need one? The answer depends on many factors, such as how complex your tax situation is and how much tax-planning advice you want.

To be sure, millions of people with relatively straightforward returns probably can handle their own returns, either on their own or with the help of software such as Intuit Inc.'s TurboTax and H&R Block Inc.'s TaxCut.

Many other taxpayers comfortable with tax issues probably could do the job themselves even if they itemize -- as long as they're patient, willing to wade through dense IRS instructions and have relatively routine situations. But it doesn't take much to drag taxpayers into surprisingly deep water. That's particularly true for people whose personal situation has changed -- such as someone who is going through a divorce or has sold a business. It's also true for many investors. Even seemingly simple issues can have twists.

If your income is $52,000 or less, consider using free federal tax-preparation and electronic-filing services through the Free File Alliance, a partnership between a group of software companies and the IRS. Check out the IRS Web site (www.irs.gov1; click on "2007 Free File"). Separately, many people can also get free help from such places as the IRS's Volunteer Income Tax Assistance program or the Tax Counseling for the Elderly program.

If you have a fairly simple situation and don't want the headache of doing it yourself, the major tax-preparation companies generally should be able to handle the job.

Sometimes, tax chains aren't entirely reliable, as indicated by last year's GAO investigation. Undercover investigators found "serious errors" at 19 outlets of several commercial tax-preparation chains. In some cases, preparers didn't report taxable income supplied by investigators. In other cases, preparers didn't take advantage of tax breaks.

Higher-income taxpayers with far more complex tax questions should consider looking for an enrolled agent, an accountant or another expert with extensive training. Among others who may need more sophisticated help: Investors with large numbers of trades; executives who receive large amounts of stock-related compensation; professional securities traders; someone who invests in numerous partnerships, or needs to file returns in many states; or a business consultant who serves on several boards of directors and has an office at home.

Don't hesitate to ask tough questions before hiring someone. For example, inquire about the preparer's credentials, including his or her educational background and training.

Find out how much your return is likely to cost. Ask what, if any, written guarantees the preparer offers in case he or she makes a mistake. Will the preparer represent you at the IRS if you're audited? And has he or she ever been sued or disciplined?

How tax preparers set their fees can vary, depending on such factors as the type of preparer, the relationship with the client and the complexity of the job.

For the "vast majority" of its clients, H&R Block charges "based on the number of forms required to complete the return," says Dan Smith, a company spokesman. "However, for tax issues that require extensive research, Block does charge based on time." He says the average fee per client last year was about $161, up from $151 in 2005.

Some pros, such as Alan Straus, a New York City lawyer and CPA, say they typically charge based on the amount of time involved. At one extreme, he has a few clients who pay as much as $15,000. At the other, he says he sometimes gets requests from clients to do a relative's return for a nominal amount.

Thomas Ochsenschlager of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants says numerous CPAs send out an estimate to clients at the start of the year -- with the proviso that the fee could change if the job turns out to involve a different amount of work than expected.

Keep in mind, though, that even the pros can make mistakes. That's what Sen. John Kerry discovered when he ran for president in 2004. The Massachusetts Democrat filed an amended return for 2003, signed by him and a representative of a Boston-based firm, to fix a mistake on his original return. The problem: The tax on the sale of the senator's interest in a painting was calculated at the wrong rate. * * *

MANY PROCRASTINATORS will lose refunds unless they file by mid-April.

The IRS said it is holding unclaimed refunds totaling more than $2.2 billion for about 1.8 million people who still haven't filed a federal income-tax return for 2003. To collect, they have to file with an IRS office no later than April 17 this year. The reason: When a return isn't filed, the law gives most people "a three-year window of opportunity" to claim a refund, the IRS says.

If you don't file within the prescribed period, the refund belongs to the U.S. Treasury.

CONGRESS-ADMINISTRATION:

Bush Appoints Dole And Shalala To Head Inquiry On Military Health Care (NYT)

By Michael Luo

DOJ_NMG_0141540

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON, March 6 — President Bush on Tuesday named the onetime Senate majority leader Bob Dole and Donna E. Shalala, former secretary of health and human services, to lead a bipartisan commission that will be charged with investigating problems at Walter Reed Army Medical Center and throughout the military's health care system.

Addressing veterans here at a meeting of the American Legion, Mr. Bush assured them that he was taking seriously the disclosure of dilapidated housing and frustrating red tape encountered by wounded soldiers at Walter Reed, the Army's premier hospital.

"My decisions have put our kids in harm's way," the president said, "and I'm concerned about the fact that when they come back they don't get the full treatment they deserve."

Mr. Dole, the 1996 Republican presidential nominee, who lost the use of his right arm in World War II, and Ms. Shalala, health secretary in the Clinton administration and now president of the University of Miami, will head "a comprehensive review" of the care of wounded troops, from the point at which they return from the battlefield to the restarting of their lives as civilians, and assess just how pervasive the problems are, Mr. Bush said.

The president said that in addition to the appointment of the commission, he had asked the secretary of veterans affairs, Jim Nicholson, to lead a group of seven cabinet members who will "focus and respond to immediate needs" of veterans and of troops returning from combat.

The steps come as an increasingly restive Congress seizes on the recent accounts of problems encountered by wounded soldiers. A second day of Congressional hearings was held Tuesday on the troubles at Walter Reed, and lawmakers promised more to come. Although they offered no specifics, Senate Democrats said they would pursue legislation addressing what they described as failure by the Bush administration to deal with longstanding concerns about the treatment of wounded troops and veterans and to properly plan for the onslaught of casualties of the Iraq war.

"This is the Katrina of 2007," Senator Charles E. Schumer of New York said at a news conference of Democratic leaders.

Since a series of articles on the shortcomings at Walter Reed appeared in The Washington Post last month, dealing especially with the problems faced by troops engaged in long recoveries and receiving outpatient care, the issue has escalated into a crisis for an administration already struggling to shore up public support for its strategy to send 21,500 more combat troops into Iraq.

The secretary of the Army and the hospital's commander were dismissed last week as a result of the problems. And at a hearing on Tuesday, some members of the Senate Armed Services Committee challenged Lt. Gen. Kevin C. Kiley, the Army's surgeon general, who himself commanded Walter Reed until 2004, on whether he should be ousted as well.

Citing complaints they said they had heard firsthand on visits to the hospital last week, committee members bore down on General Kiley and other top military officials over why they had failed to act earlier to address the problems there. Several lawmakers told of complaints they had received from constituents about troubles at other military-run health care facilities.

"It was a failure in the most basic tenets of command responsibility: to take care of our troops," said Senator John McCain of Arizona, the committee's ranking Republican, who spent more than five years as a prisoner of war in North Vietnam. "We must right the wrongs that our wounded have endured."

Repeating a new Democratic refrain, the committee chairman, Senator Carl Levin of Michigan, sought to lump the problems at Walter Reed with what he described as other examples of poor planning for the war in Iraq.

"Today's hearing," Mr. Levin said, "is about another example of the lack of planning for a war that was premised on the assumption that combat operations would be swift, casualties would be minimal and that we would be welcomed as liberators instead of being attacked by the people we liberated."

Military officials testifying at the hearing outlined steps they were taking to improve conditions at Walter Reed and streamline a daunting bureaucratic process faced by wounded soldiers getting outpatient treatment.

Gen. Peter J. Schoomaker, the Army chief of staff, said a team of health care workers had been assigned to visit other facilities in the military medical system and determine whether the problems extended beyond Walter Reed. A hot line is also being established to field complaints, General Schoomaker said. In addition, a family assistance center has been set up at Walter Reed, and the Army is considering appointing an ombudsman to act as an advocate for patients.

"No service members should have to work through a maze or a gantlet or be on his own or her own to figure things out," said Dr. William Winkenwerder Jr., assistant secretary of defense for health affairs. "It's just unacceptable."

Dr. Winkenwerder hastened to add that Walter Reed's problems did not result from lack of financing, testimony that several committee members disputed. He also dismissed any connection to plans to close the hospital in the next few years as part of a nationwide base reorganization, a proposal that some lawmakers are also beginning to question.

DOJ_NMG_0141541

In terms of immediate priorities, attention has coalesced on the cumbersome process for evaluating whether wounded troops are fit to continue in the military, or whether they should be medically retired and, if so, the level of disability benefits they should receive.

There is a focus, too, on problems in patients' transitioning from care at military hospitals to dealing with facilities run by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

David S. C. Chu, under secretary of defense for personnel and readiness, said he hoped the debate resulting from the furor over Walter Reed would address what he called a fundamental issue: "the adequacy, the structure, the nature of the nation's disability programs for injured service members."

With a patchwork of different departments involved, Mr. Chu said, it is not surprising that those caught up in the system "find it frustrating and difficult to navigate."

Walter Reed Uproar Refuels Iraq Debate (AP)

By Anne Flaherty

AP, March 7, 2007

Democrats are using the uproar over Walter Reed Army Medical Center as their latest cudgel to batter President Bush for his Iraq war policies as the administration shows signs it fears political damage from the revelations.

Reports of patient neglect and shoddy outpatient rooms at the hospital have brought Army brass to Capitol Hill to explain and apologize. Bush's handling of the war has been widely unpopular with voters, and reports about Walter Reed come on the heels of his decision to send more troops to Iraq — which has also met a negative response from the public.

Democrats are stepping up their anti-war rhetoric and casting Walter Reed as the latest Bush administration failure in planning for the war and other contingencies.

"This is the Katrina of 2007," said Sen. Chuck Schumer, D-N.Y., comparing the hospital scandal to the 2005 hurricane that left Gulf Coast residents stranded for days without federal assistance.

For its part, the Bush administration has moved quickly to try to contain the political damage. Defense Secretary Robert Gates forced Army Secretary Francis Harvey to resign last Friday, and Maj. Gen. George W. Weightman, who was in charge of Walter Reed since August 2006, was ousted from his post a day earlier.

The rapid removal of the two officials was followed by a promise by Vice President Dick Cheney and the president himself that the problems would be fixed, and the creation of high-profile panels to unearth gaps in the system.

In a speech at the American Legion on Tuesday, Bush announced he had asked former Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole, R-Kan., and former Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala, a Democrat, to lead a bipartisan probe into the mistreatment of wounded troops.

Bush also directed Veterans Affairs Secretary Jim Nicholson to set up a task force of officials from various agencies to identify problems in treating wounded troops. To underscore the message that he cares about the troops, Bush referred to the group as a task force on "returning global war on terror heroes."

To further make that point, the administration invited journalists to a naturalization ceremony next Monday at Walter Reed, when Homeland Security Secretary Michael Chertoff and Emilio Gonzalez, director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration, will swear in five wounded soldiers as new American citizens.

Bush administration officials also headed to Capitol Hill on Tuesday and apologized profusely, one by one saying they were at fault for not delving deeper into reports of staffing problems and a maintenance backlog at Walter Reed.

"I'm deeply chagrined by the events that bring us to this hearing," said David Chu, the Pentagon's personnel chief.

A White House statement released Tuesday said the president's 2008 request for $38.7 billion for military health care was double what it was when he took office.

The rhetoric failed to placate Democrats, who said the Walter Reed problems were shining a spotlight on the administration's failed war policies.

"There is a pattern here that we're just not focused on what needs to be done to help these young men and women," said Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton, D-N.Y., a 2008 presidential contender.

Sen. Edward Kennedy, D-Mass., said the Bush administration failed to plan adequately for the long and bloody war.

"And now they're failing those who have sacrificed so much," said Kennedy.

Focusing the Iraq debate on the treatment of troops could help protect Democrats from GOP charges that proposals by some Democratic lawmakers to cut money for the war would hurt troops in the war zone. The Walter Reed story is also helping Democrats by providing a distraction — if only for now — from the party's internal disagreements over how and when to force the president's hand.

DOJ_NMG_0141542

Looking to insulate themselves from any fallout, congressional Republicans have quickly jumped on board with Democrats in denouncing the mistreatment of wounded troops and hurling tough questions at Pentagon officials.

"I am dismayed this ever occurred," said Sen. John McCain, R-Ariz., top Republican on the Senate Armed Services Committee, who was captured and wounded during the Vietnam War. "It was a failure in the most basic tenets of command responsibility to take care of our troops."

Army officials on Tuesday repeated assertions that they accept responsibility but denied knowing about most of the problems.

"We have failed to meet our own standards at Walter Reed. For that, I'm both personally and professionally sorry," said Lt. Gen. Kevin C. Kiley, in charge of Walter Reed from 2002 until 2004, when he became Army surgeon general.

Kiley has said he had been aware of some issues, but told the Senate panel he was not aware of specific problems, including a backlog of maintenance orders and a lack of staff to conduct room inspections.

Sen. Joseph Lieberman, I-Conn., said Congress might need to revisit an earlier decision to close Walter Reed in light of the increasing number of wounded troops from Iraq. Sen. John Warner, R-Va., said lawmakers should examine its own oversight process, which failed to unearth problems.

Dole Will Head Inquiry Into Veterans Treatment (FT)

By Alim Remtulla And Edward Luce In Washington

Financial Times, March 7, 2007

George W. Bush on Tuesday appointed Bob Dole, the former Republican presidential candidate, to head a commission of inquiry into the treatment of injured veterans in US military hospitals following revelations of appalling conditions at Walter Reed – the leading US army medical centre.

The president's announcement came on the second consecutive day of tough congressional questioning of generals, with senators alleging that America's soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan were being "short-changed".

The hearings coincided with one of the bloodiest days in Iraq in recent months; 112 Shia pilgrims were killed in sectarian suicide bombs and nine US soldiers died in separate attacks in Baghdad. Almost 3,200 US soldiers have been killed in Iraq and more than 25,000 injured – most of them severely.

According to the Washington Post, soldiers recuperating at Walter Reed in Washington have been housed in rodent-infested quarters and have had to jump through bureaucratic hoops to obtain subsistence-level disability benefits. Similar allegations have surfaced at other army medical centres.

In a speech to veterans on Tuesday, Mr Bush said the conditions were unacceptable. "I am as concerned as you are about conditions at the Walter Reed army medical centre," he said. "We have a moral obligation to provide the best possible care and treatment to the men and women who serve our country."

Mr Bush announced that Mr Dole would lead the nine-member commission with Donna Shalala, a Democratic former secretary for Health and Human Services. Several other inquiries have been launched in the past few days, including an internal army investigation into conditions at Walter Reed.

Senior generals yesterday told the Senate armed services committee that the cause of the problem had been bureaucratic. "We all run in a bureaucratic morass," said Peter Schoomaker, the army chief of staff.

John McCain, the presidential candidate and senior Republican on the committee, said: "Senior army leaders were defensive in the face of these revelations at Walter Reed and were quick to lay blame for these failures on noncommissioned officers. I find that appalling."

Mr McCain and other senators yesterday praised Bob Gates, the new defence secretary, for removing Francis Harvey, the army secretary, and George Weightman, the general in charge of Walter Reed, last weekend. But senators said the pressure on the army medical system was likely to get worse with the "surge" of more than 20,000 new troops in Iraq.

On Tuesday a Gallup poll revealed the lowest US public support for the war since it began four years ago with 59 per cent calling it a mistake. Only 28 per cent believed the US would probably or definitely win the war in Iraq.

Dole, Shalala Will Lead Committee To Investigate Veteran Care (MCT)

By William Douglas And James Rosen

McClatchy Newspapers, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON - Calling conditions at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center "unacceptable," President Bush on Tuesday tapped former Sen. Bob Dole and former Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala to head a bipartisan commission to examine problems at veterans-care facilities across the country.

DOJ_NMG_0141543

Bush made the announcement during a speech to the American Legion in Washington as Congress continued hearings into Walter Reed's outpatient facility and care given to soldiers injured in Iraq and Afghanistan.

"Listen, I am as concerned as you are about the conditions at Walter Reed Army Medical Center," Bush told the Legionnaires. "My decisions have put our kids in harm's way. And I'm concerned about the fact that when they come back they don't get the full treatment they deserve. . . . It's unacceptable to me - and it's not going to continue."

In Congress, members of both parties continued to hammer the administration and the military for the problems at Walter Reed and at veterans' hospitals across the country at hearings on Tuesday.

"Today's hearing is about another example of the lack of planning for a war that was premised on the assumption that combat operations would be swift, casualties would be minimal and that we would be welcomed as liberators instead of being attacked by the people we liberated," said Sen. Carl Levin, D-Mich., the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Sen. Claire McCaskill, D-Mo., renewed her call at the hearing for Army Medical Commander Lt. Gen. Kevin Kiley to resign. She read a letter from a Missouri soldier and double amputee who said that the "bureaucratic red tape" he encountered at Walter Reed was attributable to Kiley's poor leadership.

"Lieutenant General Kiley had the opportunity during his time as Walter Reed commander to identify and begin correcting the issues that were evident," McCaskill read. "Rather than addressing those issues, Lieutenant General Kiley simply swept them under the rug. We as injured veterans and those family members who depend on military medical facilities deserve nothing less than the resignation of Lieutenant General Kiley."

By choosing Dole, a Republican, and Shalala, a Democrat, to lead the new commission on veterans' care, Bush selected two veteran Washington hands to address the issue after two weeks of bad publicity followed Washington Post reports that Walter Reed housed some outpatients in a moldy, insect- and rodent-infested facility. The online magazine Salon first reported problems at Walter Reed more than a year ago.

Dole represented Kansas in the Senate from 1968 to 1996 and was majority leader. He quit in 1996 and won the Republican presidential nomination, but failed to unseat incumbent President Bill Clinton. He served in the Army in World War II and was wounded by German gunfire in 1945, which left his right arm paralyzed. He was awarded two Purple Hearts and a Bronze Star during the war.

Shalala was the longest-serving Health and Human Services secretary in history, staying on the job through Clinton's eight years in the White House. She's now president of the University of Miami.

Lawmakers from both parties also hammered Deputy Defense Secretary Gordon England and Adm. Edmund Giambastiani, vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, at a House Budget Committee hearing Tuesday.

"That is unacceptable and will be fixed," England said of the Walter Reed problems. "We want absolutely the best care for the men and women who serve in our forces."

Rep. Jim McGovern, D-Mass., reacted with disbelief when England said he'd been unaware of mold, rats and other problems at Walter Reed.

"To fix that (problem) is going to require millions and millions - if not billions - of dollars," McGovern said. "I can't believe that the problems haven't trickled up. It just takes my breath away when you say you didn't know about this. This is not just at Walter Reed. This is all across this country."

England said he and other Pentagon leaders hope to use money from a $100 billion war supplemental bill now before Congress to improve conditions at Walter Reed. Under questioning, England said some of the money will probably come from funds originally tabbed to buy two F-35 Joint Strike Fighter planes.

Dole, Shalala To Lead Troop-Care Panel (WP)

By Josh White

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

President Bush yesterday named former senator Robert J. Dole and former secretary of health and human services Donna E. Shalala to co-chair a bipartisan commission that will examine the care that wounded U.S. troops receive after they return from the battlefield, one more among several high-level investigations spawned by recent revelations of squalor and bureaucratic woes facing veterans at Walter Reed Army Medical Center.

The review will encompass troops' reintegration into civilian life back home. Bush also announced that he has asked the secretary of veterans affairs to lead a Cabinet-level interagency task force to deal with immediate shortcomings in helping veterans of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

"We have a moral obligation to provide the best possible care and treatment to the men and women who have served our country," Bush told an audience of war veterans with the American Legion in Washington. "They deserve it, and they're going to get it."

DOJ_NMG_0141544

He again said that the conditions at Walter Reed that were described in a series of Washington Post reports are troubling and unacceptable. "My decisions have put our kids in harm's way, and I'm concerned about the fact that when they come back they don't get the full treatment they deserve."

As Bush was speaking yesterday morning, members of the Senate Armed Services Committee were expressing dismay on Capitol Hill as they opened hearings on Walter Reed, with senators from both political parties criticizing Army and Defense Department leaders who apparently were unaware of systemic problems in outpatient care, despite multiple warnings.

Echoing what members of a House committee said on Monday at a hearing at Walter Reed, senators said that they believe problems such as mold and rodents at the medical center's Building 18 indicate larger issues with leadership and a stifling bureaucracy.

"Good leadership should have taken these steps long ago, without prompting by a series of embarrassing news articles," said Sen. Carl M. Levin (D-Mich.), the committee's chairman, railing against what he sees as an overly complex system that shortchanges U.S. troops. "The American people are deeply angry about the shortfalls in care. The war in Iraq has divided our nation, but the cause of supporting our troops unites us."

Walter Reed's commander, Maj. Gen. George W. Weightman, and Army Secretary Francis J. Harvey both lost their jobs last week after the revelations.

Yesterday's hearing again put top Army officials in the line of fire. Lt. Gen. Kevin C. Kiley -- the Army's surgeon general, and Walter Reed commander from 2002 to 2004 -- was criticized for not addressing numerous problems with services for the wounded. A few lawmakers, including Sen. Lindsey O. Graham (R-S.C.), questioned whether Kiley should resign. Kiley replied, "I still think I've got the right skill sets and the right experience to fix these problems."

Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), a presidential hopeful and former prisoner of war, said that he was "appalled" by the lack of immediate accountability and that he was "dismayed this ever occurred."

Kiley, who at times has been dismissive of the problems, appeared more contrite yesterday: "Simply put, I'm in command, I'm accountable and I share in the failures, and I also accept the responsibility and the challenges for rapid corrective action."

Bush's new commission and Veterans Affairs task force come as the House and Senate have begun hearings about the problems at Walter Reed and as Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates awaits the results from an independent review group that has 45 days to assess outpatient treatment. After senior officials had minimized the reports about dilapidated facilities and devastating delays at Walter Reed, Army officers dispatched soldiers to evaluate nearly a dozen hospital facilities nationwide in an attempt to locate similar problems.

Bush's executive order yesterday created the President's Commission on Care for Returning Wounded Warriors, a nine-member group that Dole and Shalala will lead. Its mission will be to examine how wounded forces transition from the battlefield to civilian society and to evaluate "the coordination, management and adequacy of the delivery of health care, disability, traumatic injury, education, employment, and other benefits and services."

The decision to pair Dole and Shalala is a nod to bipartisanship. Both are Washington insiders and popular within their own political bases. They are respected leaders who can approach the issue with the perspectives of the service member, the veteran and the health-care provider -- all with the difficulties of government bureaucracy in mind. Dole is a disabled veteran of World War II with 28 years of experience as a Republican senator from Kansas. President Bill Clinton appointed Shalala as HHS secretary in 1993, and the liberal political science professor served eight years in the position -- the longest tenure in history.

"I am truly honored that President Bush has asked senator Bob Dole and me to co-chair the commission that will review the care and services provided to our returning wounded service members," Shalala said in a statement. "We all owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to our fellow Americans who are serving our country in some of the most dangerous parts of the world. They deserve access to high quality health care and other benefits and services as they transition from deployment to other military service or civilian life."

Dole could not be reached for a comment yesterday. Dole and Shalala are scheduled to meet with Bush in Washington this morning to hear his priorities for the group. The commission has a June 30 deadline for its final report.

Sen. Patty Murray (D-Wash.), a senior member of the Senate Committee on Veterans Affairs, praised Bush for "finally putting an emphasis on this crisis," but said that she is worried that the Dole-Shalala commission's findings will be ignored by a president that has pushed aside the recommendations of previous bipartisan panels, such as the Iraq Study Group.

"So we're right, I believe, to be wary of this new step from the president," Murray said on the Senate floor. "We need decisive action, not commission after commission and report after report that the president can choose to ignore."

Bush Appoints Dole, Shalala To Investigate Veterans' Care (LAT)

By James Gerstenzang And Richard Simon,
The Los Angeles Times, March 7, 2007

DOJ_NMG_0141545

Congressional Democrats consider a $5-billion healthcare funding increase.

WASHINGTON — Struggling with political fallout over shabby treatment of wounded soldiers, President Bush on Tuesday named ex-Sen. Bob Dole and former Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala to lead an investigation into care provided at military and veterans' facilities.

Democratic leaders in Congress, meanwhile, launched an effort to increase funding for veterans' care.

The moves came as lawmakers, holding a second day of hearings on reports of substandard housing and poor outpatient treatment at Walter Reed Army Medical Center in Washington, pondered whether the problems are more widespread.

Sen. Joe Lieberman (I-Conn.) said that, while the Army was moving to address the problems at Walter Reed, he thought Congress would find that the departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs have "a system that simply shortchanges those who have served us."

Defense Department witnesses who appeared Tuesday at a Senate Armed Services Committee hearing — David Chu, the Defense undersecretary for personnel and readiness; William Winkenwerder Jr., the assistant Defense secretary for health affairs; Army Chief of Staff Peter J. Schoomaker; and Lt. Gen. Kevin C. Kiley, the Army's chief medical officer — displayed varying degrees of contrition.

One senator after another challenged the ability and readiness of the Army to meet the medical care demands brought on by the fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan. A number of senators shared personal stories about their efforts to help wounded soldiers navigate the bureaucracy.

Sen. Ben Nelson (D-Neb.), recalling his efforts to aid a soldier from his home state, said he called a nurse who was assigned to the patient. "This nurse was apparently very overworked and asked me why I was butting in," he said. "I got to thinking, you know, if a United States senator has trouble trying to cut through the bureaucracy, why wouldn't you expect the average family might have a very serious problem?"

The committee chairman, Sen. Carl Levin (D-Mich.), said that after the injured were well enough to be treated as outpatients, the system failed them. "This system places these soldiers in the position of having to fight for a disability rating that entitles them to medical treatment. After all they've been through, these injured soldiers should not feel that they have to fight for what we, as a nation, have a moral obligation to provide," he said.

Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), a Vietnam veteran, said there had been "a failure in the most basic tenets of command responsibility to take care of our troops."

Schoomaker apologized and took responsibility for the conditions at Walter Reed and the failure to correct them. "I can't tell you how disappointed and how absolutely angry I am to have to sit before you today, and to stand accountable for what has occurred in the United States Army," he said.

Decrying the red tape that has tangled soldiers seeking care and decisions about whether they will remain in the service — and what support they will receive if they leave — the general added: "I will tell you that we all run in a bureaucratic morass.

"Life every day in this system is like running in hip boots in a swamp," he said. "And it sucks the energy out of you every day, not just in the medical system but in everything else that we do."

Chu, too, expressed regret, saying, "I'm deeply chagrined."

Congressional Democrats are looking at providing an additional $5 billion, perhaps more, for veterans' care — including increases for treatment of veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injuries. They are considering making the increase part of a nearly $100-billion war-spending measure now moving through Congress.

Democrats also seized on the problems at Walter Reed to ratchet up their criticism of Bush's execution of the war as they consider attaching conditions to his war-funding request. But Bush said it was critical for battlefield commanders to have the flexibility to carry out their missions "without undue interference from politicians."

Bush announced his appointment of Dole, a disabled World War II veteran who was the Republican candidate for the presidency in 1996, and Shalala, who is president of the University of Miami, in an appearance before the American Legion in Washington. He asked the nine-member President's Commission on Care for America's Returning Wounded Warriors to issue its findings by the end of June.

"I am as concerned as you are about the conditions at Walter Reed Army Medical Center," Bush said, calling the problems at what is considered one of the top military hospitals "unacceptable."

"We have a moral obligation to provide the best possible care and treatment to the men and women who served our country," Bush said. "They deserve it and they're going to get it."

james.gerstenzang@ latimes.com
richard.simon@latimes.com

Don’t Ask, Don’t Know, Don’t Help (NYT)

By Thomas L. Friedman

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

I haven't kept count, but it seems to me that the number of times I've seen President Bush and Vice President Dick Cheney give speeches about the Iraq war using smiling soldiers as their backdrops have been, well, countless. You'd think that an administration that has been so quick to exploit soldiers as props — whether it was to declare "Mission Accomplished" on an naval vessel or to silence critics by saying their words might endanger soldiers in battle — would have been equally quick to spare no expense in caring for those injured in the fight.

The squalid living conditions and red tape that have been inflicted on some recovering Iraq war veterans at Walter Reed hospital and elsewhere — which have been spotlighted by The Washington Post — are shocking in their detail, but not surprising. They are one more manifestation — like insufficient troops, postwar planning and armor — of a war that was really important to get right but really hard, which the Bush team thought was really important and would be really easy.

Mr. Bush summoned the country to D-Day and prepared the Army, the military health system, military industries and the American people for the invasion of Grenada.

From the start, the Bush team has tried to keep the Iraq war "off the books" both financially and emotionally. As Larry Diamond of Stanford's Hoover Institution said to me: "America is not at war. The U.S. Army is at war." The rest of us are just watching, or just ignoring, while the whole fight is carried on by 150,000 soldiers and their families.

In an interview last Jan. 16, Jim Lehrer asked President Bush why, if the war on terrorism was so overwhelmingly important, he had never asked more Americans "to sacrifice something." Mr. Bush gave the most unbelievable answer: "Well, you know, I think a lot of people are in this fight. I mean, they sacrifice peace of mind when they see the terrible images of violence on TV every night."

Sacrifice peace of mind watching TV? What kind of crazy thing is that to say? Leadership is about enabling and inspiring people to contribute in time of war so the enemy has to fight all of us — not insulating the public so the enemy has to fight only a few of us.

If you want to compare President Bush in this regard with Presidents Roosevelt or Wilson, pick up a copy of Robert Hormats's soon-to-be-published book: "The Price of Liberty: Paying for America's Wars."

"In every major war that we have fought, with the exception of Vietnam, there was an effort prior to the war or just after the inception to re-evaluate tax and spending policies and to shift resources from less vital national pursuits to the strategic objective of fighting and winning the war," said Mr. Hormats, a vice chairman of Goldman Sachs (International). He quotes Roosevelt's 1942 State of the Union address, when F.D.R. looked Americans in the eye and said: "War costs money. ... That means taxes and bonds and bonds and taxes. It means cutting luxuries and other nonessentials. In a word, it means an 'all-out' war by individual effort and family effort in a united country."

Ever heard Mr. Bush talk that way? After Pearl Harbor, Mr. Hormats noted, Roosevelt vowed to mobilize U.S. industry to produce enough weapons so we would have a "crushing superiority" in arms over our enemies. Four years after the start of the Iraq war, this administration has still not equipped all our soldiers with the armor they need.

As retired Army Maj. Gen. Paul Eaton pointed out, last year, because of spending in Iraq, the Army had a $530 million budget shortfall for posts, so facilities got squeezed. If Americans had been asked to pay a small tax to fill that gap, they would have overwhelmingly checked that box. They would have also paid a "Patriot Tax" of 50 cents a gallon to raise the money and diminish our dependence on oil. But no one asked them to do anything other than "sacrifice peace of mind."

If you want to help and don't want to wait for the White House bugle, here are some places to start: (1) Coalition to Salute America's Heroes (www.saluteheroes.org), (2) the Intrepid Fallen Heroes Fund (www.fallenheroesfund.org), (3) the Fisher Houses (www.fisherhouse.org) and (4) the Walter Reed Society (www.walterreedsociety.org). And one I know personally from my hometown, Minnesotans' Military Appreciation Fund (www.thankmntroops.org).

We can get just about everything wrong in Iraq, and pretty much have, but we've got to take first-class care of those who've carried the burden of this war. It's that simple.

Senators Vow To Overhaul System At Walter Reed (USAT/AP)

USA Today, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON — Senators pledged on Tuesday to consider all options to fix a broken system of caring for wounded troops as President Bush said former senator Bob Dole and former health secretary Donna Shalala will lead the administration's investigation into problems at Walter Reed Army Medical Center.

"The war in Iraq has divided our nation but the cause of supporting our troops unites us," said Sen. Carl Levin, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee. "We will do everything we can possibly do - not as Democrats or Republicans, but as grateful Americans - to care for those who have served our nation with such honor and distinction."

As his committee questioned top Defense officials, Levin also used the revelations of poor conditions and outpatient care at Walter Reed to take a swipe at Bush's war polices.

"Today's hearing is about another example of the lack of planning for a war that was premised on the assumption that combat operations would be swift, casualties would be minimal, and that we would be welcomed as liberators, instead of being attacked by the people we liberated," said Levin, D-Mich.

The hearing was Congress' second in two days on Walter Reed. Reports of wounded troops battling excessive red tape and dilapidated living conditions have concerned Republicans and Democrats. They are worried that problems there point to a broader pattern of neglect at military hospitals.

Bush told the American Legion that he had chosen a bipartisan leadership — Dole and Shalala — for the White House's investigation. "We have a moral obligation to provide the best possible care and treatment to the men and women who served our country," Bush said. "They deserve it, and they're going to get it."

Dole, a World War II veteran, was a longtime Republican senator from Kansas and a presidential nominee. Shalala headed the Health and Human Services Department during the Clinton administration.

At Tuesday's hearing, the Pentagon's personnel chief promised action.

"I'm deeply chagrined by the events that bring us to this hearing this morning," David Chu said.

Arizona Sen. John McCain said Congress will consider whether legislation or additional resources are needed.

"I am dismayed this ever occurred," said McCain, the committee's top Republican, who was captured and wounded during the Vietnam War. "It was a failure in the most basic tenets of command responsibility to take care of our troops."

Connecticut Sen. Joe Lieberman, an independent who caucuses with the Democrats, said Congress might need to revisit an earlier decision to close Walter Reed in light of the increasing number of wounded troops from Iraq. Sen. John Warner, R-Va., said Congress should examine its own oversight process.

During a House hearing Monday, two soldiers wounded in combat and a spouse of a wounded soldier recounted nightmarish stories of frustration as they tried to get medical attention and disability compensation. Army officials said they accept responsibility but denied knowing about most of the problems.

How Decay Overtook Walter Reed (CSM)

By Gordon Lubold

The Christian Science Monitor, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON

Lawmakers probing the scandal at Walter Reed Army Medical Center are saying it wasn't just a failure of leadership.

Constrained resources during a war lasting longer and costing more than anyone in the administration had expected, along with a controversial privatization initiative at the hospital, also played a role. But beyond these circumstances, one key factor has come up during congressional testimony this week: The facility was due to be shuttered in coming years, raising the possibility that officials were reluctant to make large financial commitments to it.

This combination of challenges illustrates just how strained military resources have become as the US grapples with its longest conflict since the Vietnam War. And as the current center of attention, Walter Reed has emerged as a symbol of the difficult decisions confronting the Pentagon. A core question: How can the Defense Department maintain facilities that are to be closed, including its premier Army hospital, without essentially throwing money away?

"You've got to pay the money, and the reason is simple: Up until the moment you cease operations, and you pull down the flag, it's a US military installation, and it has vital services it has to provide," says Christopher Hellman, a former congressional staffer who has followed the base-closure process closely. (Walter Reed is part of the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) process.) "The reality is you don't have the luxury of canceling contracts and delaying maintenance work at what is still an operational facility," says Mr. Hellman, now a military policy analyst at the Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation in Washington.

Still, some experts don't necessarily see that the Army made a conscious decision to stop paying maintenance bills on the facilities at Walter Reed just because it was closing.

"Buildings don't fall apart in the year and a half since the base closure commission issued its recommendations," says Jeremiah Gertler, a senior analyst on the 1995 base closure commission.

Merging operations

Under a decision made by former Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, Walter Reed was to be shuttered completely. Its medical and other operations were to merge with other military installations in the area. Much of the operation was to be folded into the existing National Naval Medical Center in Bethesda, Md., and the result was to become a new-and-improved facility called the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center.

DOJ_NMG_0141548

"The [BRAC] commission acknowledged Walter Reed Army Medical Center's rich heritage and earned reputation as a world-class medical center," the commission recommended. "However, the commission found that service members deserve a state-of-the-art 21st century medical center and that [Mr. Rumsfeld]'s proposal would increase military value."

The plan has a one-time cost of $989 million, but would save $145 million each year.

Funding for the overall BRAC initiative had been threatened considerably this year to the tune of $3.1 billion under the Joint Resolution for fiscal 2007, according to defense officials. A lower funding level would "jeopardize our ability to complete BRAC actions ... and stymie our efforts to construct facilities and move equipment and people to receiver locations," according to an internal Pentagon memo dated Feb. 15.

The Joint Resolution that cut the funding for BRAC initiatives was passed by Congress and signed by Bush on Feb. 15, but defense analysts like Hellman believe Congress will still fund BRAC at some point in the future under regular appropriations.

However, Lt. Gen. Kevin Kiley, a former commander at the hospital who is now the Army's surgeon general, testified Monday before members of an Oversight and Government Reform subcommittee to say that he had all the resources he needed.

Rep. Christopher Shays (R) of Connecticut became angry when General Kiley maintained that the Army had all the money it needed for the facility.

Failure to air dirty laundry publicly – or maintain you have enough funding when you don't, is disingenuous, Representative Shays said. "Frankly, that's almost – it's being dishonest," he said. "It's being dishonest to yourself, and it's being dishonest to us. And I will look forward to the day when someone who's in uniform comes to us and says, under oath, 'I'm not given the resources I need to do my job.' "

One comptroller's experience

But finding the money necessary to keep a crucial facility up and running should not have been a problem even if it were to be closed, says a former Pentagon official who held the purse strings.

When he was the chief comptroller of the Pentagon up until 2004, Dov Zakheim remembers visiting Walter Reed, but, he says, he was always "escorted," and therefore never had an opportunity to see the conditions in which Iraq and Afghanistan veterans were living.

But money would have been made available to fix the problems at Walter Reed, despite the fact that the facility is slated to close. "Had this situation been brought to my attention, we could have moved money. No one on the Hill would have opposed a reprogramming to improve facilities for those who were injured, wounded and/or disabled," he says.

The hospital had also begun to privatize a portion of its workforce in a controversial move that local lawmakers had decried. More than 350 support jobs at the hospital are to be outsourced.

Legislation Would Repeal Walter Reed Closure (WP)

By Steve Vogel

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

Revelations of shoddy facilities and bureaucratic nightmares at Walter Reed Army Medical Center have tarnished the reputation of the renowned military hospital. But they may also have given the 98-year-old facility a second life.

The furor surrounding the treatment of wounded soldiers has prompted some lawmakers, veterans and Army officials to ask: Why is the Defense Department closing Walter Reed -- where more than 6,000 soldiers injured in Iraq and Afghanistan have been treated since 2002 -- in the middle of a war with mounting casualties?

Congress approved and President Bush signed into law the recommendation of the federal Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Commission in 2005 that Walter Reed be closed and consolidated with the National Naval Medical Center in Bethesda, where a $2 billion expansion is being planned.

The debate has been fueled by testimony from Army officials that the problems in outpatient care have been exacerbated, in part, by the planned closure in 2011. Commanders said this has created "instability" at the hospital and made it difficult to keep a good work force, which is two-thirds civilian.

"The BRAC pressure is clear," agreed Del. Eleanor Holmes Norton (D-D.C.). "What it does is send the signal to everybody: Go look for another job because we think it's going to close down." Norton said she will introduce legislation seeking to repeal the planned closure of Walter Reed.

The issue also arose at a hearing yesterday before the Senate Armed Services Committee. "I have concerns, as we go through this long war, about taking down capacity that may be needed," testified Gen. Peter J. Schoomaker, the Army chief of staff.

"I think we should take a second look at that decision about Walter Reed," Sen. Joseph I. Lieberman (I-Conn.) responded.

DOJ_NMG_0141549

Appearing on the same panel, William Winkenwerder, assistant secretary of defense for health affairs, defended the plan to close the Army hospital, arguing that the problems there were not "in any way related" to the decision.

The BRAC commission recommendation to close Walter Reed was part of a package of base closings nationwide that was adopted by Congress. New legislation would be required to overturn the decision, an unprecedented move that could reopen debate over recommendations to close other bases.

Some area lawmakers say the climate of national outrage surrounding the disclosures at Walter Reed might persuade Congress to overturn or at least delay the closure.

"You can always overturn the law," said Rep. Thomas M. Davis III (R-Va.). "I think on this BRAC in particular, you might see some things. If you're Eleanor, you've got to seize the moment."

"This is something we should be looking at, and looking at right away," Rep. Chris Van Hollen (D-Md.), who represents Bethesda in Congress, said yesterday. "I think everyone would agree that the priority has to be that the soldiers at Walter Reed get the best possible care."

But Sen. John W. Warner (R-Va.), the ranking minority member on the Senate Armed Services Committee, cautioned during yesterday's hearing that it would be expensive to reverse the decision. He urged that the committee instead expedite spending on the planned expansion at Bethesda and a new regional Army hospital at Fort Belvoir.

The BRAC process, establishing independent commissions to decide what military bases should be closed to save money, was created by Congress to prevent political interference. Reversing the Walter Reed decision would be complex and unprecedented.

"Congress would have to invalidate the existing regulation and create a whole new law, and once they did that, there would be enormous pressure to include other facilities," said Jeremiah Gertler, a senior analyst for the 1995 BRAC commission.

In reaching the decision to close Walter Reed, the 2005 commission concluded that it was wasteful to operate two major medical centers less than 10 miles apart. The planned consolidation of the Army and Navy facilities into the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center is aimed at creating what would perhaps be the nation's premier military facility for treating wounded troops, research and education.

The Navy is moving forward with preliminary plans to expand the Bethesda campus, including the construction of a new hospital building adjacent to the existing facility.

A draft environmental impact study is to be completed in June. Last month, the Navy awarded an $8 million contract to a Virginia-based joint venture firm for architectural and engineering services.

"We have been given a mandate to move forward with the BRAC and we're doing that, because there has been no change that we know of," medical center spokesman Brian Badura said yesterday.

The Wider Shame Of Walter Reed (NYT)

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

It is impossible not to feel fury at the shameful neglect of wounded soldiers at Walter Reed's outpatient facilities, just a few miles from an oblivious and neglectful White House. Many have been housed in rooms coated with mold and infested with cockroaches and mice. They have been swamped with confusing paperwork and forced to take responsibility for managing their own medical care. And when they or their family members have complained, their pleas for help have been callously ignored.

In a desperate scramble to mute public outrage, President Bush yesterday named two political veterans to lead a commission charged with investigating conditions throughout the entire system of military and veterans' hospitals. The choices seem to be good ones: Bob Dole, a veteran wounded in World War II and a former Republican Party candidate for president, and Donna Shalala, who ran the Health and Human Services Department for President Bill Clinton.

There is plenty of blame to go around. Officials at Walter Reed were egregiously negligent. The Army's high command, and the Joint Chiefs above them, were too weak-kneed or obtuse to demand adequate resources for medical care — just as they were too fearful for their own careers to demand adequate troops to fight the Iraq war to begin with.

But the fundamental responsibility rests with the president and his former defense secretary, Donald Rumsfeld, who stubbornly insisted on going to war without sufficient resources — and then sought to hide the costs of their disastrous mistakes from the American public.

Is it any surprise that the war's wounded have been hidden away in the shadows of moldy buildings by an administration that refused to let photographers take pictures of returning coffins? Or a White House that keeps claiming that victory in this failed and ever more costly war is always just a few more months away?

The Walter Reed revelations once again put the lie to the president's claim that everything is being done to support America's troops. Just as the administration has been shockingly slow to provide the necessary body armor for troops in Iraq and notably complacent about rotating exhausted troops back into the war, so, too, has it been reluctant to confront the large casualty

DOJ_NMG_0141550

toll from Iraq and Afghanistan. Military doctors have been amazingly proficient about saving lives that would have been lost in earlier wars. But as we now know, the injured survivors too often fall through the cracks.

The new commission's investigation, supplemented by the military's own inquiries and by oversight hearings in Congress, must explore all aspects of this scandal. The revelations have flushed out disturbing complaints about shoddy treatment throughout the military and the veterans' medical system and about a hostile process for determining disability benefits. None of this can be tolerated. The soldiers who have sacrificed their health and limbs to a misguided and mismanaged war deserve the best possible care when they return — for a lifetime, if necessary. And the president needs to learn that the horrors of this war can no longer be denied or hidden away.

Lawmaker Alleges Wrongdoing, Conflict Of Interest By GSA Head (WSJ)

By Scot J. Paltrow

The Wall Street Journal, March 7, 2007

The head of the General Services Administration, which annually awards billions of dollars in contracts for many federal agencies, drew new accusations of wrongdoing and conflict of interest from a high-ranking Democratic lawmaker.

Rep. Henry Waxman, the California Democrat who chairs the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, included records he said support his allegations in a March 6 letter to GSA chief Lurita Doan. Among other items, he wrote, the records detail Ms. Doan's business relationship with a contractor that predated her GSA appointment in May 2006.

Mr. Waxman also said the records suggest Ms. Doan intervened to assure the renewal of a contract to Sun Microsystems Inc., of Santa Clara, Calif., despite staff concerns the computer-hardware maker had overcharged the government by millions of dollars.

A Sun spokeswoman said, "Our current contract with GSA represents the culmination of two years of very active negotiations. Any suggestion that anyone at GSA gave Sun special treatment during the negotiation process simply does not fit the facts."

The GSA could become the target of a wider congressional inquiry into recent contracting practices. Mr. Waxman asked Ms. Doan to turn over additional documents and to testify at a March 20 committee hearing.

In a statement, the GSA said Ms. Doan "looks forward to meeting with Chairman Waxman and his committee on the 20th to discuss GSA. As always, GSA will cooperate fully with the committee." It declined to comment further, citing the upcoming hearing.

In August 2006, Sun Microsystems was in the midst of a contract-renewal dispute with GSA. An agency audit indicated the company had failed to offer discounts for equipment and services that it routinely awarded to some commercial customers, according to the Waxman letter. But Ms. Doan allegedly pressed the staff to renew the contract anyway, the letter said.

According to the Waxman letter, a GSA contracting officer who refused to do so was replaced by another official who renewed the contract at terms less favorable to the government than an offer on the table.

In January, the Washington Post reported that Ms. Doan personally had awarded a no-bid, $20,000 contract to a public-relations company owned by a friend, Edie Fraser.

Mr. Waxman said newly obtained records show Ms. Doan also had a longstanding business relationship with Ms. Fraser, dating back to when Ms. Doan owned a surveillance-technology company, New Technology Management Inc. It paid at least $417,500 to companies affiliated with Ms. Fraser, Mr. Waxman's letter said.

Ms. Doan had said publicly that she supported terminating the $20,000 contract with Ms. Fraser's company when questions were raised about it. But Mr. Waxman said evidence shows that she had tried to keep it in place.

Ms. Fraser wasn't available for comment.

Write to Scot J. Paltrow at scot.paltrow@wsj.com1

Waxman Seeks GSA Chief's Testimony (WP)

By Robert O'Harrow Jr. And Scott Higham

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

A powerful House committee chairman released new details yesterday about a widening investigation into allegations of "improper conduct" by the chief of the U.S. General Services Administration.

Rep. Henry A. Waxman (D-Calif.), head of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, said his investigators had obtained information that raises "further questions" about GSA Administrator Lurita Alexis Doan's efforts to give a no-bid job to a longtime friend and professional associate.

Waxman also revealed new allegations that Doan "asked GSA officials in a January teleconference how the agency could be used to help Republican candidates," in possible violation of federal law.

He invited Doan to testify before his panel on March 20.

"You should be a model for integrity in contracting," Waxman said in his 10-page letter to Doan. "For this reason, I want to give you a chance to respond to allegations of improper conduct that have surfaced recently."

The GSA released a statement yesterday on Doan's behalf:

"The Administrator looks forward to meeting with Chairman Waxman and his committee on the 20th to discuss GSA. As always, GSA will cooperate fully with the committee. It is inappropriate, however, for GSA to comment further on the upcoming Congressional hearing."

In the letter, Waxman said his investigators learned that the GSA's former chief counsel "was alarmed" that the $20,000 job Doan had given on July 25 to companies run by her friend Edie Fraser had not been put out for bidding. The job was to produce a 24-page report on the GSA's use of minority-owned and women-owned businesses.

Alan R. Swendiman, now a special assistant to President Bush, stated to committee investigators "that he had never seen any GSA administrator personally award a contract, that it was highly irregular, and that he had serious concerns about its propriety and legality."

Waxman's letter follows a January report in The Washington Post that described the no-bid arrangement and Doan's ongoing disputes with her agency's inspector general's office. As GSA head, Doan presides over the government's largest broker of goods and services, which manages $56 billion in contracts.

The no-bid arrangement was terminated on Aug. 4 after GSA lawyers and other agency officials noted that it violated procurement rules.

Waxman's committee launched its investigation in January. Investigators obtained documents showing that the relationship between Doan and Fraser was more involved than previously known.

In an earlier interview with The Post, Doan described her authorization of the no-bid job with the companies run by Fraser as a simple mistake. The GSA last month sent a letter to Waxman's committee strongly defending Doan and saying that her actions were not improper.

Doan has been embroiled for months in disputes over her leadership of the agency. Soon after taking office last May, she clashed with the inspector general's office over its budget.

Last summer, the inspector general began examining the no-bid arrangement between Doan and the companies run by Fraser, Diversity Best Practices and Business Women's Network.

Doan said the allegations against her stem from her budget dispute with the inspector general's office. She maintained in the interview that she signed paperwork approving the no-bid job and "handed this off and then that was the last that I worried about it."

But Waxman's investigators found that Doan "persisted in efforts to award the contract to Ms. Fraser after questions were raised about its validity." Swendiman, then the GSA's general counsel, told committee investigators that as soon as he saw the paperwork, "he immediately and repeatedly advised that the contract be terminated, but he was unable to convince" Doan to do so, Waxman's letter said.

Swendiman told committee investigators that he gave Doan a letter terminating the arrangement, but that Doan did not sign it. "Ultimately, Mr. Swendiman said he had to take matters into his own hands . . . he directed the appropriate contracting officer to sign the termination letter without waiting for your approval," Waxman's letter to Doan said.

The letter said committee investigators had found e-mails providing evidence that Doan continued to "encourage" her staff to "devise a mechanism for awarding a contract" to companies run by Fraser after the arrangement was terminated on Aug. 4.

That same day, Doan requested a "point person to move this forward," in discussions with her chief of staff, John F. Phelps, according to an e-mail cited by the committee.

"Contrary to your public assertions that no further action was taken on this matter, you joked to Mr. Phelps about your staff's continuing efforts to advance Ms. Fraser's interests: 'I think we have quite a few cooks now stirring this broth,' " Waxman said in his letter.

Doan's relationship with Fraser began when Doan was the president of New Technology Management Inc., a Reston-based company that sold surveillance gear and had government contracts worth more than $200 million. In 2003, Doan retained Fraser to promote her and her company.

From 2003 to 2005, Doan paid "at least $417,500 to companies affiliated with Ms. Fraser before you became GSA Administrator, including approximately $320,000 in management consulting fees and $97,500 in corporate and personal sponsorship of events produced by Ms. Fraser's firm," Waxman's letter said.

Fraser continued working closely with Doan before and after Doan assumed office last May, records cited by the committee show. Two weeks after her confirmation, Fraser wrote Doan an e-mail with the subject line: "Checklist for GSA and Lurita," according to a document obtained by the committee and The Post.

DOJ_NMG_0141552

In that e-mail, Fraser suggested the names of corporate executives that Doan should meet. She also offered Doan advice about the GSA's Web site and indicated that she was already in talks with GSA officials about the diversity report, even though the agreement for the work would not be signed until nearly two months later, on July 25.

After the no-bid arrangement was terminated, Fraser sent another e-mail to Doan:

"Lurita, I will do anything for you and will do for the rest of my life," Fraser wrote to Doan on Sept. 6. "Bottom line, want relationship with GSA and will keep delivering as you know. But I have spent so much time at GSA from the report planning to these sessions with ZERO $$ How do we solve . . ."

Through an attorney, Fraser said she did nothing wrong in her work with Doan. "She is outraged by the suggestion that she has done anything unlawful or unethical in dealing with the GSA or Lurita Doan," her attorney, Jonathan N. Rosen, said in a previous statement. "Any such suggestion is not supported by any facts and is contradicted by her lifetime of advocacy in the service of others."

Fraser has stepped down as chief executive of the firms, according to a statement issued on Monday by Working Mother Media Inc., their parent company.

Waxman said he also wants to question Doan about a Jan. 26 teleconference she had with her senior staff and 40 of the agency's political appointees stationed around the country. During the call, Doan allegedly asked "how the agency could help 'our candidates' in the next elections," Waxman's letter said, citing "multiple sources." Committee investigators said one regional GSA administrator described "an effort to exclude House Speaker Nancy Pelosi from an upcoming opening of an environmentally efficient 'green' courthouse in San Francisco."

Regarding a different courthouse opening in Florida, Doan "noted that former President Bill Clinton had expressed interest in attending," and "stated that an effort should be made to get Senator Mel Martinez, the General Chairman of the Republican National Committee, to attend," the letter said.

Under the federal Hatch Act, executive branch officials are prohibited from "engaging in partisan politics while on duty, in official government work space, or with government equipment," Waxman said in the letter.

"It would be an obvious abuse if you suggested to agency officials that the activities of the agency be manipulated to provide political advantages to Republican candidates," he wrote.

Subpoena Threat May Have Unlocked NASA Probe (HC)

By Daniel Dale

Houston Chronicle, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON — The Bush administration agreed Tuesday to release to Congress by April 2 the results of a probe into alleged wrongdoing by NASA Inspector General Robert Cobb.

Democratic members of the House Committee on Science and Technology had threatened to issue subpoenas to force the White House to turn over the documents. Rep. Brad Miller, the North Carolina Democrat who chairs the committee's Investigations and Oversight Subcommittee, said representatives had tried without success to secure the release of the documents since November.

Some of Cobb's staffers have accused him of suppressing investigations into safety concerns — including some on the readiness of space shuttle Columbia — and the theft of valuable shuttle data. President Bush appointed Cobb in 2002 to monitor NASA's activities.

Housing and Urban Development Inspector General Kenneth Donohue completed an investigation into the allegations in August. But as of Monday, Miller said, officials from the administration's Office of Management and Budget refused to set a deadline for the release of Donohue's report or NASA's eventual response to it.

A spokesman for the OMB would not say why the administration changed course.

A subcommittee meeting set for today to consider subpoenas "may have clarified the situation for them," Miller said.

"Unfortunately, I don't see this administration responding to gestures of goodwill to Congress," said subcommittee member Dana Rohrabacher, R-Calif. "They generally need a kick in the butt. That's what this subpoena (threat) was, and they deserved it."

Investigation Report On NASA Inspector To Be Released (ORS)

The Orlando Sentinel, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON -- White House officials have agreed to release a confidential report by April 2 that details a federal investigation of NASA Inspector General Robert Cobb, congressional sources said.

The decision comes after more than two months of wrangling between Congress and an oversight group on whether federal lawmakers could have access to the longstanding Cobb probe.

Launched last year following complaints to the office of U.S. Sen. Bill Nelson, D-Fla., the inquiry reportedly was completed by the end of last summer and examines dozens of allegations against Cobb in his role as inspector general.

However, a White House oversight group still has not decided what, if any, action to recommend.

Cobb, a White House political appointee, has been NASA's inspector general since April 2002. Investigators from the Department of Housing and Urban Development were told to conduct the inquiry and then forward their findings to the President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency.

NASA Administrator Michael Griffin also is reviewing the findings.

Some of the complaints accuse Cobb of stifling investigations, mistreating employees and maintaining more than the traditional arms-length relationship he was supposed to have with top officials of the agency he was supposed to independently monitor.

Cobb has denied any wrongdoing. A spokeswoman for his office would not comment.

In recent months, the investigation has drawn the attention of House and Senate Democrats, who have pressed administration officials for more information since winning control of Congress.

"All the parties involved, including the NASA IG [inspector general], deserve a rapid and fair disposition of the case," Rep. Bart Gordon, D-Tenn., wrote on Jan. 31 to James Burrus, among those on the White House committee reviewing the accusations against Cobb.

"A [congressional] Committee of jurisdiction has a right to learn the nature of the allegations against an Inspector General and to learn of the findings of that effort."

A science subcommittee had scheduled a meeting Wednesday to consider getting the report by subpoenaing Griffin, HUD and the special White House council overseeing the investigation.

But the chairman of the oversight subcommittee with the House Committee on Science and Technology said he reached an "oral agreement" with administration officials Monday night to release the documents by April 2 -- without the need for subpoenas.

"They are trying to avoid a confrontation with Congress," said Rep. Brad Miller, a North Carolina Democrat. He had planned a meeting of the subcommittee today but canceled after reaching the records agreement.

A spokeswoman for the Office of Management and Budget, which oversees the President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency, said today that OMB would not comment.

Michael Cabbage of the Sentinel staff contributed to this story. Mark Matthews can be reached at mmatthews@orlandosentinel.com or 202 824-8222. Michael Cabbage can be reached at mcabbage@orlandosentinel.com or 321 264-2392.

As To The Direction Of The Roberts Court: The Jury Is Still Out (NYT)

By Linda Greenhouse

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON, March 6 — Over the Presidents' Day weekend, Douglas W. Kmiec went to a popular legal Web site, Findlaw.com, to post his thoughts on the Supreme Court at midterm.

Mr. Kmiec, a law professor at Pepperdine University, had nothing but praise for Chief Justice John G. Roberts Jr., his onetime government colleague from the Reagan administration days. The chief justice was "splendidly" on course toward his professed goal of getting the court to "speak with one voice," Professor Kmiec wrote, noting that 11 of 14 cases decided so far had been 9 to 0.

Unanimity "adds both credibility and stability to the law," he wrote, adding that under its new chief justice, it was evident that "the court is more likely to reach" that desirable measure of agreement.

The day after Professor Kmiec offered that assessment, the court came back from a four-week recess and issued two 5-to-4 decisions.

"I have the same effect on the stock market," Professor Kmiec said in rueful conversation a few days later.

His follow-up essay, posted on Slate and titled "Up in Smoke," went directly to the point. "The Roberts honeymoon may be over," he wrote.

The cautionary tale was clear: for anyone tempted by the joys of punditry to proclaim that the Roberts court is clearly one thing or another, this is a time to sit back, wait and see.

It is not only that the term's most challenging decisions lie ahead, rulings on abortion and school integration that will almost certainly reveal fissures too deep to paper over. It is that the Roberts court's record so far is being asked to carry more weight than it usefully can for those trying to take the new chief justice's measure.

Numbers do not lie, but out of context, they can easily mislead. For example, much was made of the court's unanimity during the last term, which was the first for the Roberts court. About half the decisions were unanimous (49 percent by one count, 53 percent by another: the difference is over whether to ascribe unanimity to justices who disagree on the reasoning behind a 9-to-0 outcome). So far this term, the record is about the same, 8 out of 18.

One factoid that may actually prove significant: of the four 5-to-4 decisions so far this term, the only justice in the majority in every case was Anthony M. Kennedy, powerful ammunition for the view that in a crunch, this is Justice Kennedy's court.

Filling the Docket

The justices were so mortified at finding themselves without enough cases to fill their December calendar that they used the most obvious means to avoid a repetition: they stepped on the gas.

After granting only two new cases in November and eight in December, they lowered the bar in January and somehow found 20 cases worthy of their attention. This led to a crowded April calendar reminiscent of the time 20 years ago when the court routinely sat for afternoon arguments as well as morning ones and turned out 150 decisions a year, more than twice the current number.

The result is a see-saw argument schedule, with only one case a day for much of February and March, but three for most of the days the court will sit in April.

The problem for the justices is that April is the final argument month, presenting a substantial challenge if cases are to be decided by late June, when the court breaks for the summer.

The time pressure could be even more acute if the court agrees to an expedited schedule for deciding the cases on the rights of the detainees at Guantánamo Bay, appeals that were filed at the court on Monday with a proposed argument date of May 7.

The justices might plausibly have held some of the April cases over for argument when the new term begins in October, easing some of the pressure they often feel then to get a fast start on filling the calendar. But that idea, championed by some at the court, was rejected because it would have guaranteed that the total number of decisions for the current term, now hovering at about 70, would have fallen into the mid-60s. Life tenure, evidently, is no insulation from concern with one's image.

Alarmism in the Blogosphere

Jan Crawford Greenburg, an ABC News correspondent who covers the court, posted a startling item last week on her blog, Legalities. Under the heading "Faith and Frailty," she wrote that the "real drama" of an argument concerning the Bush administration's religion-based initiative came when the argument ended.

Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg's delay in getting to her feet and leaving the bench, Ms. Greenburg wrote, seemed a sign of possible ill health and "made me think I'd better start pulling those possible retirement files together."

The alarming item quickly made its way around the blogosphere, puzzling court insiders who know that Justice Ginsburg, 73, is in fine health and keeps to a schedule that would exhaust most people who are decades younger. When the term ends this summer, for example, she is scheduled to go to Paris with Chief Justice Roberts, Justice Kennedy and Justice Stephen G. Breyer for meetings with judges of French and other European courts.

The explanation is, quite literally, pedestrian. According to her chambers, Justice Ginsburg had kicked off her shoes during the argument and could not find one of them.

Federal Education Building To Be Named For LBJ (MCT)

By Maria Recio

McClatchy Newspapers, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON - Lyndon Baines Johnson, a Democratic president from Texas whose only official memorial in Washington is a hard-to-find grove on an island in the Potomac River near the Pentagon, soon will have more suitable recognition - the Department of Education headquarters.

By voice vote, the House of Representatives agreed Tuesday to name the Education Department building near the Capitol the Lyndon Baines Johnson Federal Building. Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchison, R-Texas, has introduced a similar bill in the Senate.

The lack of a prominent Washington memorial to the 36th president has galled Democrats, especially Rep. Gene Green, D-Texas, for years. But Green couldn't get past former House Majority Leader Tom DeLay, R-Texas, whose conservative views couldn't stomach Johnson's "big government" philosophy. DeLay, said Green, told him, "Not on my watch."

"Of course a conservative like Tom DeLay would block naming anything after the guy who opened the door for the federal government to destroy our education system," said DeLay spokesperson Shannon Flaherty. "The only bill Mr. DeLay would have brought to the floor wouldn't rename the Department of Education - it would de-federalize it."

But the new Democratic majority looks at things differently. Call it "No Democrat left behind."

DOJ_NMG_0141555

"LBJ passed away over 30 years ago, but to this day has no federal buildings bearing his name in the Capitol area," Green said. President Reagan is honored with the International Trade Center building, and former President George H.W. Bush has the Central Intelligence Agency headquarters named for him.

Some Democrats complain that Johnson's only tribute in Washington is a rock. Indeed, the prominent feature of the Lyndon Baines Johnson Memorial Grove on the Potomac River is a pink granite monolith from the Texas Hill Country, according to Dana Dierkes, a public relations specialist with the National Park Service's George Washington Memorial Parkway.

Johnson has numerous sites honoring him in Texas, including NASA's Johnson Space Center, a state historical park near his hometown of Stonewall and a presidential library and museum at the University of Texas in Austin.

Green, joined by most Texas Democrats and Republicans, led the effort on the House floor to recognize Johnson, a former schoolteacher who was a member of the House and Senate and served as Senate majority leader, vice president and president.

"The Vietnam War soured President Johnson's legacy," Green said in an interview. "We still have to recognize his domestic legacy."

Johnson signed more than 60 education bills into law, including the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, which established Head Start; the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; and the Higher Education Act of 1965.

House Majority Whip James Clyburn, D-S.C., the highest-ranking African-American in Congress, cited Johnson's support for civil rights and education.

"He made his name as the first education president," Clyburn said. "He was the first president to recognize the strong federal investment in education."

Lawmakers hope to move quickly to pass the bill because former first lady Lady Bird Johnson, 94, is ailing.

Personnel Issues Find An Audience On Capitol Hill (WP)

By Stephen Barr

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

The civil service system got a little oversight from Congress yesterday, signaling that federal-employee issues may receive more attention as Democrats wrangle with the White House over budget and policy priorities.

The House Armed Services readiness subcommittee debated the new National Security Personnel System that the Pentagon has started rolling out to Defense Department civilians, the first oversight hearing since the NSPS was created in 2003, subcommittee chairman Solomon P. Ortiz (D-Tex.) noted.

But that wasn't all. The House Appropriations financial services and general government subcommittee, a new panel, held a hearing on "issues in the federal workforce."

Rep. JosÃ© E. Serrano (D-N.Y.), the chairman, and other panel members questioned the Bush administration's outsourcing initiative and asked what can be done to improve federal hiring practices. President Bush's budget, Serrano said, "leaves a lot to be desired for preparing government agencies for the future of the federal workforce."

The hearings featured Bush administration officials, labor leaders, outside experts and a few House members who candidly acknowledged that they don't have a handle on federal personnel issues. Union leaders did not miss the opportunity to press their points.

John Gage, president of the American Federation of Government Employees, called for a repeal of the new Defense Department personnel system, arguing that the Pentagon went too far in trying to curb collective-bargaining rights. The union has stopped parts of the NSPS through a federal lawsuit, and the case is pending before a U.S. appeals court.

At the appropriations hearing, union representatives said they were concerned that the salaries of many federal employees keep falling behind those in the private sector. Colleen M. Kelley, president of the National Treasury Employees Union, said the administration's plan to raise federal pay by 3 percent next year was inadequate and recommended a 3.5 percent increase. J. David Cox, the AFGE secretary-treasurer, told the panel that federal workers should get a 4 percent raise next year.

Serrano made no commitments on federal pay but noted that recent raises have lagged behind what a 1990 law required. He joined the union leaders in opposition to outsourcing of federal work and invited suggestions from the unions on how to revamp rules on contracting out.

At the hearing on the new Defense Department civil service system, some House members urged Pentagon and union leaders to "find a way to work together," as Ortiz put it.

The Pentagon got off on the wrong foot with unions at the start of the NSPS four years ago with a plan that unions claimed would gut their rights.

Although Pentagon officials recast the personnel system in response to employee feedback, the AFGE and other unions filed a lawsuit in federal court that blocked changes in labor-management rules. The government employees union has gone on

DOJ_NMG_0141556

to fault other parts of the NSPS, which has been designed to bring more rigorous standards to how Defense Department employees are paid, promoted and disciplined.

Rep. Walter B. Jones (R-N.C.) lamented that the NSPS reflects the "shadow of Donald Rumsfeld" and may be "another failed policy" caused by arrogance at the top of the Pentagon. Employee support for the NSPS is vital, Jones said, adding that "if you can't bring the players together, you can't have a victory."

Michael L. Dominguez, one of the Pentagon's point people on the personnel system, agreed that "we need employee buy-in" but stressed that the first wave of Defense Department civilians to migrate to the new system are excited to be part of an effort that enhances improved communication between employees and their supervisors.

By the end of the month, more than 114,000 Defense Department employees will be covered by the NSPS, he said. "Fundamental organizational and cultural change takes time -- it can't be achieved overnight. We are taking the time to do it right," said Dominguez, principal deputy undersecretary of defense for personnel and readiness.

Max Stier, president of the nonpartisan, nonprofit Partnership for Public Service, urged the House committee to arrange for regular assessments of the system by an outside evaluator and to obtain other data that would show whether it is helping the Pentagon to compete for top talent and to reward the best workers.

"The key is ongoing oversight," Stier said.

The Reliable Source (WP)

By Amy Argetsinger And Roxanne Roberts

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

Jenna's Next Venture: A Book & a Tour

Jenna Bush has landed a big-deal book deal -- and with it the requisite media tour, which means the 25-year-old super-private first twin will be venturing out into the public eye this fall like never before.

HarperCollins Publishers announced yesterday it has acquired Bush's first book, a nonfiction account of an impoverished 17-year-old single mother in Panama with HIV, whom the president's daughter met while interning there with UNICEF.

Aimed at a teen/young adult market, "Ana's Story: A Journey of Hope" will have a first printing of 500,000 copies.

"She's trying to share information about children and young adults who are living with poverty and disease, and trying to reach out to young adult readers to inspire them to get involved," said Kate Jackson, editor of the children's book division of HarperCollins. "We were really impressed by her vision."

Bush's college pal Mia Baxter took the photos that will illustrate the book. The deal was negotiated by Bob Barnett, the D.C. attorney-to-the-stars who has lined up book contracts for the Clintons, Mary Cheney and Alan Greenspan. He wouldn't disclose any amounts other than to say that it's a "very, very good deal." However, Bush does not stand to profit -- all her proceeds, after expenses, have been pledged to UNICEF charities.

Jackson said Bush has completed several drafts: "It's almost done." And yes, she's signed on for a publicity blitz. "She believes in this from the bottom of her heart," Jackson said. "She knows she is going to get a lot of attention, and she wants to direct it to the cause."

Oh, but we always get distracted! Take the author photo, provided by HarperCollins. Gotta ask: What's that on her left ring finger?"It's not an engagement ring, definitely not," said Laura Bush's spokeswoman Susan Whitson. "She's not engaged."

The Man W ho's Ann: How to Play Her Now?

Another Ann Coulter outrage! While conservatives and liberals alike howl about the implications of her latest shock-mock rhetoric, we step back and ask the big question: What's the impact on Washington's preeminent Ann Coulter impersonator?

"I play her very tongue- in-cheek," says Bill Pietrucha, who dons a blond wig, leggings and sheath dress to become the right-wing pundit. "She's just so over the top that she's the gift that keeps on giving to a comedian." For the past five years, the 58-year-old actor-writer has been portraying Coulter at fundraisers, comedy clubs and college campuses: "Obviously, my audiences are not neoconservatives."

Professionally, Pietrucha is trying to figure out how to incorporate Coulter's recent anti-gay slur into the act. But personally, he thinks she just needs to chill:"Boy, that girl needs Prozac in her oatmeal."

HEY, ISN'T THAT . . . ?

Â· Scooter Libby looking forlorn and nervous Monday night at what proved to be a last supper of sorts at Chef Geoff's downtown. The former Cheney aide sat with a large group, including attorney Ted Wells , but while the others dug into dinner entrees and cocktails, Libby just picked at a small endive salad. He did have his share of the table's three bottles of red, though.

Â· Karen Hughes and Hadassah Lieberman lunching together yesterday at the Four Seasons, which we like to imagine was the White House's secret back-channel attempt to get Sen. Joe Lieberman to switch parties but may well have been perfectly innocent. The senator's wife had her arm in a cast -- no details about that from the senator's office.

DOJ_NMG_0141557

QUOTE:
"I've
been
teased
about it relentlessly. . . . The cameras lie. It's a fraud."

Jenna Bush Embarks On Book 'Journey' (USAT)

By Bob Minzesheimer, Usa Today
USA Today, March 6, 2007
Hopes to inspire kids to tackle poverty, HIV and 'exclusion'

Jenna Bush, in a rare interview, says her forthcoming book for teens — about a 17-year-old single mother in Panama who is living with HIV — will end with a "call to action."

HarperCollins announces today that it's publishing Bush's Ana's Story: A Journey of Hope this fall. It will be illustrated with photographs by Mia Baxter, a former classmate of Bush's at the University of Texas.

The president's daughter, 25, says the book is not political. It's aimed at "getting kids thinking and involved," Bush said Monday by phone from Panama, where she has worked since September as an unpaid intern for UNICEF.

Bush, a former public school teacher in Washington, D.C., says: "I'm aware that not all kids can pick up and fly to Panama. I'm very lucky."

But, Bush says, "there's so much they can do" to deal with issues of "exclusion" — from research on HIV discrimination to "inviting new kids to sit with them in the cafeteria."

The book grew out of her UNICEF job to "put a face on statistics" and document the lives of children in Central and South America who live in extreme poverty.

Jenna and her sister, Barbara (who works at a New York museum), have tried to avoid publicity and have been protected by the White House. But, she says, "I'm willing to give up some of my anonymity" to promote the book and "start a dialogue with kids."

A book tour is planned in schools, libraries and bookstores. "This is not about me," she adds, "but the kids I met here."

The Bush twins have been fodder for tabloids and gossip columnists for their partying and underage drinking. Jenna Bush, who campaigned for her father in 2004, says she doesn't worry about her media image: "I care what people who know me think of me. I think they would disagree (with her image). I like to go to bed early."

Kate Jackson, editor of HarperCollins Children's Books, says she was impressed by Bush's "intellect, drive and passion." A first printing of about 500,000 copies is expected.

Bush says she will donate her earnings to UNICEF. She says she "very, very modestly" hopes her book will have some of the influence of two books about girls caught up in the Holocaust: Lois Lowry's novel Number the Stars and Anne Frank's The Diary of Anne Frank.

Historian Carl Sferrezza Anthony says 23 presidential children are authors, most of them after their fathers left office. Patti Davis' 1986 novel, Homefront, caused a stir because of characters who resembled her father, Ronald Reagan, and stepmother, Nancy Reagan.

Bush Twin Set To Become An Author (WT)

By Jennifer Harper
The Washington Times, March 7, 2007

Jenna Bush could be a best-selling author by autumn: The first daughter has written a nonfiction account of her experiences during the last five months as a UNICEF volunteer in Central America. Realities of life have resonated with the 25-year-old daughter of President Bush and first lady Laura Bush.

"Ana's Story: A Journey of Hope" will be published by HarperCollins in September, chronicling the challenges faced by a teenage single mother in Panama who is an orphan herself and HIV positive.

"I have been inspired by my work with adolescents in Central and South America. These young people have faced extreme hardships and exclusion, but are strong in spirit and have an incredible will to succeed," said Miss Bush, who currently teaches several days a week in a Panamanian homeless shelter.

She's witnessed the hardships personally, traveling through the countryside of Paraguay and Argentina and recording the personal narratives of youngsters with considerable inner mettle.

"It's my hope to motivate young Americans to increase their awareness of other young people around the world, to learn about the challenges they face, how they triumph over adversity and to become involved in helping them," Miss Bush said.

DOJ_NMG_0141558

"I think there will be enormous interest in this book. In many ways, it is a real call to action," said Robert Barnett, the Washington-based lawyer who brokered the deal between publisher and author.

His list of literary clients include such high-powered luminaries as former President Bill Clinton; Democratic Sens. Hillary Rodham Clinton of New York and Barack Obama of Illinois; Vice President Dick Cheney's wife, Lynne; former Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan; former White House press secretary Ari Fleischer; Queen Noor of Jordan; and former Pakistani Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto -- among others.

"I was very taken by how articulate and compassionate Jenna Bush was, and how well she had done with the writing," Mr. Barnett said. "She's committed to the issues and causes she has written about."

HarperCollins will offer an initial printing of 500,000 copies of the book, which also includes color photography from Mia Baxter, a classmate of Miss Bush from her days at the University of Texas.

"We were very moved by Jenna's passion for this project. Her message in this book is about hope, involvement and inclusion," said Susan Katz, president of HarperCollins Children's Books.

The intended audience is young adults, and yes, there will be a book tour. However, profit is not on the mind of Miss Bush, who will donate her earnings to UNICEF, an international charitable group with immunization, educational and sanitation outreaches in 191 countries. HarperCollins also has agreed to donate a portion of the profits to the charity.

Miss Bush will complete her UNICEF internship in June; her twin sister, Barbara, continues to work at Cooper-Hewitt National Design Museum in Manhattan.

News of the book attracted substantial world press coverage. "Jenna Bush writes book about single mom," heralded an Associated Press account. The White House declined to comment on the book yesterday.

America's Unfriendly Skies (WSJ)

By Michael E. Levine

The Wall Street Journal, March 7, 2007

In the U.S. you can buy or rent the basics -- food, shelter and clothing -- from foreigners. Foreign-owned and controlled firms participate freely, many very successfully, in such critical industries as automobile manufacturing and sales, electronics, municipal water supply, oil exploration and production, pharmaceuticals, power generation and almost everything else we use. You can buy a ticket on a foreign airline between the U.S. and virtually everyplace in the world that gets air service, and foreigners can rent you cars and sell you a bus ticket. But no foreigner offers you a ticket for air travel within the U.S.

This is not because no one wants to. In the latest example, Virgin Airways of Britain, a company that controls airlines in the U.K., continental Europe, Australia and the South Pacific, has been trying since 2004 to start a domestic airline based in San Francisco. It has assembled a management, cleared the Federal Aviation Administration's safety hurdles and bought new planes, half a dozen of which are now sitting wastefully on the ground, waiting for permission to fly.

The problem is that the law that supposedly deregulated the airline industry still contains provisions dating from the 1930s forbidding foreign ownership and control of domestic airlines. Over the years, ingenious lawyers have devised investment and governance formulas that would allow de facto foreign investment in domestic airlines with enough control to protect it from management incompetence or treachery. Not one has ever been allowed to succeed. Egged on by airline pilot unions and the biggest U.S. airlines, Washington has forbidden them to do so.

In the current case, Virgin has turned itself inside out trying to construct a governance and financial structure that would satisfy a liberal interpretation of existing law. Although inclined as a matter of current policy to find a way to approve its application, the Department of Transportation has bowed to congressional grandstanding at the behest of unions and large airlines that don't want the competition. Some also want to hold Virgin hostage to get entry to London's Heathrow airport. As recently as December, the DOT once again shied away from interpreting its rules to allow Virgin America to start flying.

In response to the previous set of DOT objections, Virgin America now has an entirely U.S. management and an elaborate financial arrangement which at least nominally cedes financial control to U.S. citizens. It meets the letter, if not the spirit, of the protectionist requirements of current law. But that's apparently not good enough to allow Virgin to offer traveling Americans the chance to accept or reject its particular mix of service and prices in a supposedly free marketplace.

Now the last excuse for government intransigence has been taken away. On Friday, the DOT announced that the U.S. and European Union have initialed an agreement that creates an entirely open-entry single-market regime between the U.S. and the whole EU, including London's Heathrow Airport. In return, the Europeans insist that the U.S. allow cross-border investment in U.S. airlines. But the Europeans, having had the DOT dash its expectations regarding investment before, are insisting that Congress agree explicitly to liberalize EU investment in U.S. airlines.

For U.S. travelers, this is a good deal. The prospect of more competition may make existing managements and workers nervous, but travelers get to try Virgin's flashy brand of service while the new competition holds prices down. For many airline

DOJ_NMG_0141559

shareholders and workers, it will allow a troubled U.S. airline to be bailed out and rebuilt, if necessary, by the likes of Air France, British Airways or Lufthansa.

The U.S. has no monopoly on protectionists. Washington should make clear that its approvals depend on the British government's resisting British Airways' efforts to kill the Heathrow access part of the deal. In addition, there are many technical ins and outs to defining "ownership" and "control." We can expect protectionist opponents to try to block the deal by defining these terms in a way that effectively prevents investment by leaving so little control that the investor is at the mercy of its management or banks. Congress must avoid this and hurry to approve this deal in a way that allows Virgin and others to go forward. The DOT should help put them on the spot by approving Virgin's application now.

Mr. Levine, distinguished research scholar and senior lecturer at NYU School of Law, was one of the architects of airline deregulation and has been a senior executive at three airlines.

Kerry's Swift Retribution (WSJ)

The Wall Street Journal, March 7, 2007

The country long ago moved beyond John Kerry's Presidential ambitions, but the Senator, as he seems never to tire of reminding us, has not. Now Mr. Kerry's throbbing grievances jeopardize President Bush's nominee for U.S. Ambassador to Belgium.

Last week Sam Fox, a 77-year-old St. Louis businessman, sat before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for a confirmation hearing widely expected to be uncontroversial. But in the 2004 campaign, Mr. Fox gave $50,000 to the Kerry opposition group Swift Boat Veterans for Truth.

After some desultory questioning about "the image of America in Europe," Mr. Kerry solicited Mr. Fox's opinions as to "the politics of personal destruction" -- to which Mr. Fox replied, "Senator, you're a hero." Not good enough. Mr. Kerry launched into a harangue about 527 committees (the Swift Boaters were one of those) and other affronts to his station in life, none of which were germane to Mr. Fox's qualifications to serve.

Mr. Kerry: "Do you think this should matter to me?" Mr. Fox: "I'm sorry?" Mr. Kerry: "Do you think this should matter to me?" Mr. Fox: "Yes, I do, I do." Mr. Kerry: "Do you think it should matter to everybody here, as a Senator?"

Mr. Fox, a major donor to Republican campaigns, says he gives generously to a variety of causes, most of them philanthropic, and doesn't recall the reasoning behind his Swift Boat donation. We can assume it was to defeat Mr. Kerry, though Mr. Fox also pointed out, sensibly enough, that 527s are creatures of contemporary politics: "That's the world we live in."

That's an insight Mr. Kerry's Democratic colleagues, who in solidarity may block Mr. Fox's appointment in a vote on Friday, would do well to remember. The Democrats are not without their own free-range advocacy groups, such as MoveOn.org. Before they build the gallows, they might consider what will constitute a hanging offense when the political composition of the government shifts.

The Senate confirmation process is already congested by Democratic intransigence, from Bush appellate judges to U.N. ambassadors. But at least these conflicts came with some veneer of substantive objection, not merely the desire for political retribution.

OTHER NEWS:

Greenspan Rates Chance Of Recession (USAT/BLOOM)

By Craig Torres

USA Today, March 7, 2007

Former Federal Reserve chairman Alan Greenspan said there's a "one-third probability" of a U.S. recession this year, and the current expansion won't have the staying power of its decade-long predecessor.

"We are in the sixth year of a recovery; imbalances can emerge as a result," Greenspan, 81, said in an interview Monday at his office in downtown Washington. "Ten-year recoveries have been part of a much broader global phenomenon. The historically normal business cycle is much shorter" and is likely to be this time, he added.

Greenspan's outlook contrasts with the prediction of his successor, Ben Bernanke, who told Congress last week that the economy may strengthen this year.

Bernanke's upbeat assessment helped steady stock markets on Feb. 28 after a plunge the day before that some traders attribute partly to Greenspan's musing that a recession couldn't be ruled out.

"It is possible that we can have a recession at the end of this year," said Greenspan, who ran the central bank for 18 years until January 2006. Bernanke, 53, declined to comment.

DOJ_NMG_0141560

Little more than a year after leaving the central bank, Greenspan is returning to economic forecasting, a role he enjoyed before entering government service in 1974, during the administration of President Gerald Ford.

He isn't trying to predict a number for gross domestic product or inflation: He's trying to capture the trend and when it might be about to change.

Private-sector economists and policymakers are calling for the expansion, which began in 2001, to continue. The Fed expects the economy to grow from 2.5% to 3% this year, and 2.75% to 3% next year, according to forecasts presented to Congress last month.

Greenspan said that he has been careful to avoid making life difficult for his successor.

His contracts with clients stipulate that there will be no reporters present and no recordings. He said he tries to have an exchange with an audience, where he often learns something that helps him hone skills he has worked on for 50 years.

"I was aware of the problem that if I stayed public, I could make it difficult for Ben," he said. "For the most part it has worked. I was beginning to feel quite comfortable that I was fully back to the anonymity I was seeking.

"I was surprised at this recent episode," he added.

Investors said financial markets are playing down Greenspan's recession risk messages.

"It's not the message we're getting from the Fed," said Bernd Wuebben, senior bond market strategist at BNP Paribas New York. "All Fed speakers have tried to assuage the market."

Greenspan Lays Odds On U.S. Recession (WP/BLOOM)

By Craig Torres

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

Former Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan said yesterday that there is a "one-third probability" of a U.S. recession this year and that the current economic expansion won't have the staying power of its decade-long predecessor.

"We are in the sixth year of a recovery; imbalances can emerge as a result," Greenspan said in an interview at his District office. "The historically normal business cycle is much shorter" than a decade and is likely to be this time, he said.

Greenspan's outlook contrasts with the prediction of his successor, Ben S. Bernanke, who told Congress last week that the economy might strengthen this year. Bernanke's upbeat assessment helped steady stock markets on Feb. 28 after a plunge the day before that some traders attributed partly to Greenspan's musing that a recession could not be ruled out.

"It is possible that we can have a recession at the end of this year," said Greenspan, who ran the central bank for 18 years until January 2006. Bernanke declined comment.

Little more than a year after leaving the central bank, Greenspan, 81, is returning to economic forecasting, which he did before entering the government in 1974. He isn't trying to predict a number for gross domestic product or inflation; instead, he's trying to capture trends and when they might change.

Private-sector economists and policymakers are predicting that the expansion, which began in 2001, will continue. The Fed expects the economy to grow 2.5 to 3 percent this year, and 2.75 to 3 percent next year, according to forecasts presented to Congress last month.

Greenspan said he had been careful to avoid making life difficult for his successor.

In appearances he makes for clients, his contracts stipulate that no reporters may be admitted and no recordings made. He said he tries to have an exchange with an audience, in which he often learns something that helps him hone skills he has worked on for 50 years.

"I was aware of the problem that if I stayed public, I could make it difficult for Ben," he said. "For the most part it has worked. I was beginning to feel quite comfortable that I was fully back to the anonymity I was seeking.

"I was surprised at this recent episode," he said.

Investors may have taken notice of his comments on Feb. 26 in Hong Kong because they considered them prescient. The day after he mentioned the risk of a recession, a Commerce Department report showed sales of nonmilitary capital goods, excluding aircraft, dropped 2.7 percent in January, the biggest decline since September 2001. Orders slumped by the most in three years.

Broader capital spending is also weakening. Corporate purchases of equipment and software declined at an annual rate of 3.2 percent last quarter, the biggest decline since the final three months of 2002, according to Commerce Department figures.

Greenspan said he did not think that so-called point forecasts, in which economists refine their projections down to decimal points, could be accurate in the near term. "We really can't forecast" the economy over the next two years, he said.

Greenspan worked for what is now the Conference Board, a New York business group, as an industrial-metals analyst from 1950 to 1953. Tracking inventories, he was able to come up with a model of final demand. He expanded that model to textiles, aluminum and oil.

DOJ_NMG_0141561

He found that large-scale models that used aggregate data averaged out the nuances and changes he could pick up at an industry level. Finally, some of the assumptions of firms' pricing power didn't hold up.

"I realized I was trying to see how the world works in the context of individual entities," Greenspan said.

Under his chairmanship, the Fed staff began surveying companies directly on how their businesses were doing.

"We certainly devoted some resources to our own gathering of anecdotal information," said Michael J. Prell, former head of the Division of Research and Statistics, the Fed's central forecasting unit. "Every other week, we would contact some subset of a sizable group of firms."

Greenspan's unique discipline both frustrated and amazed Fed colleagues, especially those trained in sophisticated economic modeling.

"His great value is that he has an idiosyncratic approach," said Laurence H. Meyer, a Fed governor from 1996 to 2002 who often sparred with the chairman over the outlook. "The reason why Greenspan gets and deserves disproportionate weight is that he doesn't get caught up in all the themes that tie together in a consensus forecast. He is looking at all the different strands of data."

Once, Meyer said, he was sitting in a meeting with the Fed staff discussing the inflation implications of import prices. Out of nowhere, Greenspan asked about steel-ingot prices. Meyer said he wasn't even sure what an ingot was.

"Why would I ever even ask that?" Meyer, a founder and vice chairman of the model-based forecasting firm Macroeconomic Advisers in St. Louis, said in an interview.

Macroeconomic Advisers isn't forecasting a recession this year, and Meyer said markets "over-responded" to what Greenspan said.

"Who wouldn't agree that it is possible we could have a recession?" Meyer said. "I think we are closer to the middle of an expansion than the end of an expansion."

Greenspan Risks New Row With Fed (FT)

By Krishna Guha In Washington

Financial Times, March 7, 2007

Alan Greenspan risked stirring renewed controversy on Tuesday when he told the Bloomberg news agency that there was a “one-third probability” of a US recession this year.

The former Federal Reserve chairman’s comments are starkly at odds with the relatively upbeat assessment made by Ben Bernanke, his successor, in testimony to Congress last week.

Mr Greenspan’s latest remarks come barely a week after he told investors in Hong Kong that he thought a US recession this year was “possible”. The earlier comments spread quickly through the investment community, spooking investors and contributing to turmoil in financial markets.

Following a global sell-off in equities and other assets, Mr Greenspan was forced to clarify his statement, declaring he had said that a recession this year was “possible” but not “probable”.

The markets appeared to take Mr Greenspan’s latest comments in their stride but the remarks show he has decided not to keep quiet in the light of the past week’s experience, highlighting a dilemma for Mr Bernanke.

The Fed chairman is inclined to think it is not Mr Greenspan’s fault the market takes his comments so seriously. Moreover, such is the respect and goodwill towards Mr Greenspan within the Fed, as well as in markets globally, that there would be little benefit for Mr Bernanke in being seen to clash publicly with him.

However, the apparent second-guessing of the Bernanke Fed’s economic view by its former chief risks adding to the volatility and undermining the current chairman’s efforts to establish his authority in the markets.

Mr Greenspan on Tuesday told Bloomberg he was “surprised at this recent episode”. He said: “I was aware of the problem that if I stayed public I could make it difficult for Ben. For the most part it has worked. I was beginning to feel quite comfortable that I was fully back to the anonymity I was seeking.”

He said there were signs that the US’s economic expansion was ageing. “We are in the sixth year of a recovery. Imbalances can emerge as a result,” he said.

Mr Bernanke has not put any figure on the likelihood of a US recession this year. However, his public remarks suggest that, while he feels there may be some chance of a hard landing so painful that it results in negative growth this year, the likelihood of that is much less than one in three.

Mr Greenspan’s interview overshadowed a speech by Mr Bernanke later in the day, in which he called for new legislation to tighten controls on Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, the government-sponsored mortgage finance institutions.

Mr Bernanke said their portfolios “represent a potentially significant source of systemic risk”. He suggested that the two institutions should only keep on their books loans that promoted low-cost housing.

DOJ_NMG_0141562

Slowing Productivity Growth, Higher Labor Costs Spur Fears (WSJ)

By Conor Dougherty

The Wall Street Journal, March 7, 2007

U.S. productivity grew more slowly at the end of last year while labor costs shot up, a combination that could raise inflation fears.

Nonfarm business productivity -- a measure of the average worker's output per hour -- rose at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 1.6% in the 2006 fourth quarter. That was down from a previous estimate of 3% growth, the Labor Department reported. Moreover, third-quarter productivity was also revised downward to a 0.5% decline, compared with the 0.1% drop previously reported.

More startling was the growth in unit labor costs, which was revised to 6.6% growth in the fourth quarter, compared with a previous estimate of 1.7% growth. Labor represents about two-thirds of the cost in the production of goods and services, and the combination of higher wages and slower growth in productivity raises the possibility that companies will boost prices to cover the increased cost of labor, creating inflationary pressure.

Economists cautioned, however, that wages may not be increasing as fast as the data might imply. First, productivity reports are notoriously volatile quarter-to-quarter. Also, for the first time in several years, last year's fourth-quarter unit-labor-cost figures included an adjustment for the unusually large bonuses paid to Wall Street executives at the end of last year. Such bonuses help to lift sales of sports cars and yachts, but they don't play a large role in inflation, because so few people get them. The 6.6% increase in unit labor costs compares with a 3.0% increase in the fourth quarter of 2005, when there was no adjustment for large bonuses.

Economists also noted that fourth-quarter labor-cost data might be revised after the government incorporates more complete wage data.

Still, the numbers were regarded as bad news. "The headline numbers exaggerate the problem, but I still think there is a problem in that wage costs are accelerating a little bit," says Nariman Behravesh, chief economist at consulting firm Global Insight.

Since 2000, productivity growth had been running at historically high levels, peaking at a 4.1% rate in 2002 and marking 3.7% in 2003, which economists attributed to technological advances that make it easier for fewer employees to do more work. Last year, growth in nonfarm business productivity fell to 2.1%. On average, productivity was up 1.6% for 2006, the slowest growth rate in nine years.

Gains in productivity typically slow at the end of an expansion cycle. "You've stretched your work force, gotten that last ounce of blood out of them, and you have to bite the bullet and hire some new people," says Joshua Shapiro, chief U.S. economist for MFR Inc.

Separately, the Commerce Department reported factory orders fell 5.6% in January.

Write to Conor Dougherty at conor.dougherty@wsj.com1

Revised Figures Show Sharper Slowdown In Productivity In The Fourth Quarter Of 2006 (NYT)

By Jeremy W. Peters

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

In business cycles, productivity slowdowns can be a difficult time for workers because employers typically respond by letting employees go. New labor statistics released yesterday showed that productivity is indeed slowing faster than first thought, raising the question of whether layoffs are soon to follow.

A report yesterday by the Labor Department said productivity in the final three months of 2006 was about half the rate first reported. And for the year, it grew at the slowest pace since 1997. The government also said that companies compensated employees at a much higher rate than first calculated, which could add to pressure on businesses.

The combination of rising labor costs and wilting productivity is potentially troublesome for the nation's economic outlook and for the Federal Reserve, which is trying to temper inflation while maintaining a healthy rate of growth.

Productivity among nonfarm businesses in the fourth quarter was 1.6 percent, compared with the initial reading last month of 3 percent, the Labor Department said. Unit labor costs, a measure of compensation that factors in worker productivity, jumped 6.6 percent, compared with an initial estimate of 1.7 percent. For the year, unit labor costs rose 3.2 percent, the most in six years.

"If unit labor costs are rising you have a choice as a company," said Robert J. Barbera, chief economist at the advisory firm ITG. "You can raise prices to recoup those losses, or you can cut back on employment. The Fed is fearful of A. My assertion is that we're much more likely to get B."

DOJ_NMG_0141563

Economists attributed a considerable chunk of the rise in labor costs in the fourth quarter to year-end bonuses but said that the overall rate of inflation was still high enough to give the Fed pause. Many economists said the new statistics reduced the chances the Fed would lower rates this year, as investors have been expecting.

Productivity growth is a necessary force to maintain the momentum of an economic expansion, and without it, the economy is more vulnerable to stalling. The annual rate of productivity increase for 2006, 1.6 percent, was the lowest since 1997. By comparison, productivity advanced 2.1 percent in 2005 and 2.9 percent in 2004.

In a research note yesterday, Goldman Sachs economists said the lower productivity reading could foreshadow a “lower speed limit for the economy.”

Slowing productivity is the latest sign that the economic outlook for businesses is less than inviting. As a result, businesses appear to be cutting their spending. The Commerce Department reported yesterday that orders placed with manufacturers fell last month at the fastest pace in six years. Last week, a steep slide in orders for durable goods — heavy-duty items like generators, aircraft and computers — added to fears that the economy was weaker than previously thought and helped set off a deep plunge in stock prices.

While many economists see unemployment rising slightly, few are predicting a sharp contraction in the labor market.

U.S. Stocks Rally As Markets Rise In Asia, Europe (WP)

By Tomoeh Murakami Tse

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

U.S. stocks rallied yesterday following a recovery in Asian and European markets. The surge in all major U.S. indicators occurred despite disappointing manufacturing figures and was stronger than the 50-point bounce-back Feb. 28, a day after the Dow Jones industrial average shed 416 points.

The Dow jumped 157.18, or 1.3 percent, to close at 12,207.59. The tech-heavy Nasdaq composite index rose 44.46 points, or 1.9 percent, to 2385.14. And the broader Standard & Poor's 500-stock index rose 21.29 points, or 1.6 percent, to 1395.41.

Despite the gains, the three market indicators were still down for the year.

"It was the first nice rally in the wake of last week's air pocket," said Stephen Stanley, chief economist at RBS Greenwich Capital Markets. "People are starting to feel increasingly comfortable that the damage is going to be contained."

Stanley and others cautioned that there was still room for another downturn, with lingering concerns about subprime mortgages in the United States and the availability of credit worldwide. "I wouldn't say we're out of the woods yet," he said.

U.S. stocks, buoyed by gains in overseas markets, opened higher and remained on solid footing throughout the day. After a sharp sell-off Monday, Hong Kong's Hang Seng index rose 2.1 percent. In Japan, where Treasury Secretary Henry M. Paulson said the global economy was as strong as he had ever seen, the Nikkei gained 1.2 percent.

European markets were higher, too. Britain's FTSE 100 rose 1.3 percent, France's CAC 40 was up 1 percent, as was Germany's DAX index.

The markets largely shrugged off U.S. government reports indicating worker productivity was down, labor costs were up, and that factory orders fell almost 5.6 percent in January, the largest monthly decline since July 2000.

The Labor Department said labor costs increased by 6.6. percent in the fourth quarter of 2006, not 1.7 percent as originally estimated. The agency also revised worker productivity numbers; it grew at an annualized rate of 1.6 percent, not 3 percent. Productivity measures the value of worker output per hour; when it falls, it costs businesses more to produce the same amount of goods and services.

Meanwhile, the yen fell against all major currencies. Analysts have been monitoring the yen, whose recent ascent suggested that a major source of capital in the global market may be drying up. This would happen if investors, who have been borrowing the low-yielding yen to buy higher-returning assets elsewhere, reversed their bets to get out of risky positions. The yen traded at 116.67 against the dollar yesterday, compared with 116.37 the day before.

The U.S. rally was broad. On the New York Stock Exchange, advancing issues outnumbered declining issues by 5 to 1. Market movers included IBM, General Motors, Alcoa and American Express, all up more than 2 percent.

Some financial firms that had taken a beating on concerns about subprime mortgages also rose. Countrywide Financial, the nation's biggest mortgage lender, was up $1.65, or 4.69 percent, to close at $36.85.

"People went after the stocks that have been hammered," said Andrew Brooks, the head equity trader at T. Rowe Price.Movers

Advanced Micro Devices rose 14 cents, to $14.09. The chipmaker said it would probably miss its first-quarter sales forecast.

Citigroup rose $1.33, to $50.58, after offering $10.8 billion to buy Nikko Cordial, a Japanese investment bank.

DOJ_NMG_0141564

Blue Chips Lead The Charge As Stocks Halt 3-Day Skid (WSJ)

By Peter A. Mckay

The Wall Street Journal, March 7, 2007

The stock market's dreary mood gave way to a nonstop rally, but some Wall Street pros caution stocks may yet hit a new bottom.

Overseas trading continued to be a focus for U.S. investors. For a change, that worked in their favor, as they awoke to find solid stock rallies in Hong Kong and Tokyo, followed by similar gains in London.

The Dow Jones Industrial Average opened higher and rose steadily. It finished up 157.18 points, or 1.3%, to 12207.59, off 2.1% on the year, ending a three-day skid.

Twenty-nine of the blue-chip average's 30 components rose. Johnson & Johnson slipped just 0.2%.

The market's gains came despite lackluster economic data, which analysts said could portend further disappointments and a bout of selling. The Labor Department revised its tally of fourth-quarter productivity downward and its tally of labor costs upward, a trend that could result in greater inflation if it continues.

"That's just about the worst combination of data that you could see in this report," said strategist Stephen Wood of the asset-management firm Russell Investment Group. But he said he doesn't think the economy will sustain labor-cost increases through the summer.

Analysts said the unwinding of bearish bets known as short sales also appeared to help the market, as the Standard & Poor's 500-stock index gained 1.5%, or 21.29 points, to 1395.41, off 1.6% on the year. The tech-stock-led Nasdaq Composite Index rallied 1.9%, or 44.46 points, to 2385.14, off 1.2% on the year. Short sales involve selling borrowed stock in the hope the share price will fall before the loan has to be repaid. Buying shares to repay those loans can temporarily drive up stock prices.

Many investors will pay close attention to employment data due out Friday, looking for clearer signs of the economy's direction.

Duncan Richardson, chief investment officer at Eaton Vance Corp., said the market could make another move down in the short term. Eventually, he thinks investors' appetite for less-risky stocks will help big-name companies like those in the Dow and S&P 500 to post solid gains for 2007.

"You can't really extrapolate too much from any near-term market move," Mr. Richardson said. "But given the level of earnings and valuations, the market certainly has gotten to very attractive levels."

Outside the U.S., stocks rose in dollar terms. The Dow Jones World Stock Index, excluding U.S. shares, rose 1.4%, or 3.35 points, to 240.82.

In major U.S. market action:

Stocks rose1, and bond prices fell2. The 10-year note shed 3/32 point, or 93.75 cents for each $1,000 invested, pushing the yield up to 4.528%.

The dollar was mixed3. Against the Japanese currency, the dollar rose to 116.62 yen, compared with 115.83 yen Monday. The euro rose to $1.3123, compared with $1.3093.

Write to Peter A. McKay at peter.mckay@wsj.com4

Dow's Bounce May Not Signal Recovery (USAT)

By Adam Shell

USA Today, March 7, 2007

NEW YORK — A 157-point Dow gain is normally a sign of a healthy stock market. But when a big up day like Tuesday follows a 736-point drop in the previous nine sessions, the rally comes with its fair share of caveats and question marks.

Wall Street has historically viewed large one-day rebounds after steep, scary declines with suspicion and trepidation. And traders' reaction to Tuesday's stock surge fit the age-old profile to a T.

Jittery investors still reeling from Wall Street's worst slide since 2001 welcomed the Dow's explosive gain. But the short-term boost was not enough to warrant an all-clear sign that the worst bout of selling since last summer had run its course. It also didn't serve as proof that the bull market, which peaked two weeks ago, was back on — at least, not yet.

"It's too soon to tell," says Hugh Johnson, chief investment officer at Johnson Illington Advisors. "I'm always skeptical. I'd love to see three to five days of stable markets to rebuild lost investor confidence."

That's not to say that there weren't positives to take away from Tuesday's breakout. The day began with stock gains in Asia, which spread to Europe and eventually to the USA. It was the best day for the Dow since July 24, 2006. And unlike last Tuesday, when the Dow plunged 416 points and all 30 of its components finished in the red, only one Dow stock fell Tuesday.

Reversals like that often signal a change in trend.

DOJ_NMG_0141565

"We got a nice bounce," says Todd Leone, head of listed trading at Cowen & Co. "We are seeing some strong buying. It is real." But even Leone acknowledges that the psychology of the market has changed. Risk-taking, he says, is down. "People are a little more nervous," he says, nervous enough that another down leg can't be ruled out.

Janna Sampson, portfolio manager at OakBrook Investments, says the market could be turbulent through midyear until investors get a clearer picture of how the economy is holding up amid a housing slowdown and credit crunch.

"I'm not expecting a 20% decline, but I'm not expecting a big rebound, either," she says, adding that investors should ignore the volatility and remain invested for the long term.

But Rich Suttmeier, chief market strategist at financial website RightSide.com, is predicting a bigger decline. The fact that most of the stock market indexes around the world peaked at the same time last month was a sign of a market top, he says.

"We are in a transition from a bull market to a bear market," he says. "The new bear market started on Feb. 20 when the Dow peaked."

The fact that so few people are predicting a dire outcome could be cause for alarm, notes Michael Farr, chief investment officer at Farr Miller & Washington. "Denial is not a good investment philosophy," he says. "To deny there are any real worries is a risk of its own."

Fed Chief Says Fannie And Freddie Should Stick To Affordable Housing (WSJ)

By Greg Ip

The Wall Street Journal, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON -- Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke said Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac should be restricted "almost exclusively" to holding home loans or securities that promote affordable housing.

If implemented, Mr. Bernanke's recommendation could require drastic reductions in the companies' portfolios, which are dominated by regular mortgages and mortgage-backed securities. But prospects appear dim for any such restriction given opposition from the Democratic majority in Congress.

Fannie and Freddie are known as government-sponsored enterprises, or GSEs, because they were originally chartered by Congress. Although they are now private, shareholder-owned companies, investors still perceive them as being backed by the federal government, which enables them to borrow significant sums at rates barely more than the U.S. Treasury pays, and invest the proceeds in higher-yielding mortgages and mortgage-backed securities.

"The size and the potentially rapid growth of GSE portfolios … raise substantial systemic risk concerns," Mr. Bernanke told the Independent Community Bankers of America via satellite from Washington. The group is meeting in Hawaii. "A straightforward means of anchoring the GSE portfolios to a clear public mission would be to require Fannie and Freddie to focus their portfolios almost exclusively on holdings of mortgages or mortgage-backed securities that support affordable housing." (Read the full speech1)

Meeting such a standard could potentially require huge sales by Fannie and Freddie of their holdings of mortgages and mortgage-backed securities, since less than 30% of those portfolios -- currently about $1.5 trillion in total -- are oriented towards affordable housing, according to its regulator, the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight. Mr. Bernanke didn't explicitly call for sales of regular mortgages. In theory, the companies could instead allow current holdings of such mortgages to mature.

In negotiations, Treasury and House Financial Services Committee Chairman Barney Frank (D., Mass.) had proposed giving a new regulator power to control the size of their companies' portfolios. Mr. Bernanke went further by calling for a mandatory limitation to affordable-housing mortgages.

Mr. Bernanke said GSE purchases do little to improve the efficiency of the regular mortgage market or make such mortgages cheaper. By contrast, concentrating their purchases on affordable homes could significantly improve the depth of that market, "reducing costs and increasing credit availability to prospective home purchasers."

Nor should such purchases entail greater risk for the companies, such as by buying subprime mortgages, Mr. Bernanke said, "so long as the GSEs continue to adhere to sound underwriting practices."

Senate Banking Committee Chairman Christopher Dodd (D., Conn.) said the Fed chairman's remarks support his concerns that the GSEs have tougher new oversight.

"In my view, there is broad agreement that we should create a new regulator to oversee Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and the Federal Home Loan Banks. This new regulator must have a number of core powers in order to do its job effectively, and to be considered credible in the eyes of the public. These powers include: the ability to set both minimum and risk-based capital levels for the Enterprises; enhanced enforcement and prompt corrective action powers, including the authority to set and enforce prudential management and internal control standards; the ability to put a GSE into receivership; and authority over both safety and soundness and mission," Mr. Dodd said.

DOJ_NMG_0141566

"The goal in giving the new regulator this broad responsibility is to ensure a more coherent regulatory framework, better enforcement, and a more consistent, deeper, and more aggressive effort on affordable housing at all the GSEs. In addition, I believe that the new regulator must be politically independent and funded outside of the appropriations process. It is my hope that this shared consensus can be the basis for moving strong and effective legislation forward."

--Damian Paletta contributed to this article.

Write to Greg Ip at greg.ip@wsj.com2

Bernanke Calls For Stronger Regulation Of Fannie, Freddie (WP)

By David S. Hilzenrath

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

Federal Reserve Chairman Ben S. Bernanke said yesterday that the scale of Fannie Mae's and Freddie Mac's mortgage investments could pose risks to the financial system, and he called for them to limit their holdings almost exclusively to loans for affordable housing.

Bernanke's proposal would sharply curtail the growth and profits of the government-chartered mortgage-funding companies, and it would force them to focus on investments that have, as he described it, "a clear and measurable public benefit."

Congressional efforts to overhaul regulation of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac have been moving in a different direction.

Rep. Barney Frank (D-Mass.), chairman of the House Financial Services Committee, thinks a new regulator should be empowered to control the size of the companies' investment portfolios as needed to ensure their financial safety and soundness, said Steve Adamske, a spokesman for Frank. The House passed legislation along those lines last year, but the Senate took no action.

Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac have $1.4 trillion of mortgage-related investments, which are sensitive to movements in interest rates and require extensive hedging to reduce risk. The companies have debts and outstanding-credit guarantees of $5.2 trillion, exceeding the U.S. government's $4.9 trillion of publicly held debt, Bernanke said.

Chartered by the government to promote home ownership, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac have two main lines of business: They package mortgages into securities for sale to investors, guaranteeing that the investors will be paid; and they make investments of their own. They are required to devote a portion of their funding to mortgages on affordable housing, such as loans for homes in poorer neighborhoods.

According to the Fed, the perception that the government stands behind Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac enables them to borrow at low interest rates and buy assets with higher returns in a kind of perpetual-profit machine. That gives them an incentive to expand their holdings, Bernanke said.

In his first speech on Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, Bernanke echoed longstanding Fed concerns. Although the Fed has concluded that they do not seem to pose an immediate threat, "their portfolios represent a potentially significant source of systemic risk," Bernanke said.

His solution: "Tying the portfolios to a purpose that provides measurable benefits to the public would help to ensure that society in general -- not just GSE shareholders -- receives a meaningful return in exchange for accepting the risks inherent in the portfolios," Bernanke said in the text of remarks prepared for delivery by satellite to a gathering of community bankers in Hawaii.

Less than a third of the companies' mortgage holdings advance the government's affordable-housing goals, according to an estimate by the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, a regulatory agency.

Freddie Mac spokeswoman Sharon McHale said all of the loans in Freddie Mac's portfolio promote affordable housing in one way or another. "Our entire portfolio is critical to us achieving our housing mission," McHale said.

A Fannie Mae spokesman declined to comment.

How, if at all, to limit the companies' investments has been one of sticking points in long-stalled but recently renewed legislative efforts. A proposal supported by the Treasury Department last year would have made affordable housing one of the factors for a government regulator to consider when setting portfolio standards.

Howard Glaser, a mortgage industry consultant, said Bernanke's proposal is "not going to fly." That approach "is not a new idea, but it's one that's been implicitly abandoned as the legislative debate has moved on," Glaser said.

EDITORIAL: Bernanke Hits Fannie (WSJ)

The Wall Street Journal, March 7, 2007

One duty of the Federal Reserve Chairman is steward of the U.S. financial system, so it's good news that Ben Bernanke stepped up yesterday and put himself on record as favoring limits on Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Maybe his intervention will help prod Congress to stop protecting the two mortgage giants from regulatory discipline.

DOJ_NMG_0141567

Readers of these columns know the incredible tale of Fan and Fred, the "government-sponsored enterprises" that have grown like Topsy thanks to an implicit government subsidy and now pose a systemic risk to the entire financial system. Mr. Bernanke put it this way: "The perception of government backing allows Fannie and Freddie to borrow in open capital markets at an interest rate only slightly above that paid by the U.S. Treasury and below that paid by other private participants in mortgage markets."

The companies use this subsidized pricing advantage to buy huge amounts of mortgage-based securities, or MBSs, and thus "can enjoy profits of an effectively unlimited scale." Socialism can be a great business for the lucky few who game the political system.

Congress lets the duo play this game because the companies claim that their vast MBS portfolios help promote "affordable housing," and who doesn't like that? But Mr. Bernanke also blew away that smokescreen by noting Fed research showing that these portfolios "appear to have no material effect on the cost or availability of residential mortgages." In order to buy those MBSs, the companies issue roughly equal amounts of debt, so the net result is a wash in supplying capital for mortgage finance.

However, the companies keep piling up debt to buy those MBSs, growing them tenfold from 1990 through 2003. Today, the two have a combined total of $5.2 trillion in debt and MBS obligations, which exceeds the entire $4.9 trillion in publicly held U.S. government debt. We can hear our readers wondering why they can't get in on a similar "business model."

Mr. Bernanke's sensible recommendation is that Congress give Fan and Fred's regulator the power to limit those MBS portfolios. He has other useful ideas, but his key point is that these MBS portfolios should be limited to a role that actually does promote affordable housing -- that is, providing liquidity for "mortgages extended to households with below-median-income." This would mean less profit for Fannie and Fred but also less danger to taxpayers in case the duo guess wrong in the market and get into financial trouble.

This is all so eminently sensible that it probably won't happen. Democrats in Congress claim to want to help poor homeowners, but they seem only too happy to let Fannie and Freddie grow rich by investing in the higher-income mortgage market that is already liquid enough. They could better serve taxpayers and the poor if they took Mr. Bernanke's counsel.

Knives Out? Law Firms In New Era (WSJ)

By Nathan Koppel

The Wall Street Journal, March 7, 2007

As More Corporate Defenders Take Contingency-Fee Work, Payouts, Risks Bring Conflict

Minneapolis law firm Faegre & Benson LLP may soon face a problem most firms would be happy to have: how to split a $100 million-plus fee.

The firm of around 475 lawyers mainly makes its living representing corporations that pay an hourly rate for work. But in 1989 it agreed to take on a contingency-fee case, representing more than 3,000 Alaskan fishermen claiming damages from the Exxon Valdez oil spill. That meant Faegre would pay the legal costs upfront. If its clients won, the firm would get a percentage of the potentially huge judgment. If not, it could lose the money it had sunk into the case.

The bet appears to have paid off. Late last year, a federal appeals court awarded the Valdez plaintiffs $2.5 billion in punitive damages, which could yield nearly $900 million for Faegre and other firms representing plaintiffs in the case. In January Exxon Mobil Corp. asked for a rehearing, but those are granted sparingly.

Now the firm, which factors in annual productivity when paying partners, may have to wrestle with how to compensate those who produce one whopping sum after years of work.

Traditionally, the nation's top corporate law firms have shunned contingency-fee work -- often cases that target big corporations for punitive damages -- for fear of alienating their core clients. But driven by pressure to boost profits, more such firms are crossing over to what some lawyers call the "dark side."

The shift is sparking tensions within big corporate firms. Besides the financial risks, there's a philosophical issue in the debate. While it hasn't come up at his own firm, David Oesting, a partner at Davis Wright Tremaine LLP, which also represented plaintiffs in the Exxon Valdez case, says, "You can understand that senior counsel would say, 'Punitive damages are sins and the work of the devil, so how in the hell could you have been arguing that you should get them?' "

Howrey LLP in Washington sank $20 million into representing farmers in an antitrust suit against tobacco companies before the case was settled in 2004, generating about $80 million in fees for the firm. "A partner was going around the firm questioning my sanity at the same time that, unbeknownst to him, I was negotiating a settlement," partner Alan Wiseman says. "It is hard. You are not only dealing with adversaries across the table, but you have to manage your partners' expectations."

A rise in patent litigation is fueling the trend. Because such cases can result in particularly huge awards, law firms are more willing to handle them on a contingency basis.

DOJ_NMG_0141568

"Expenses are increasing for firms, while at the same time their clients increasingly seek discounts" on lawyers' hourly rates, says legal consultant Ward Bower of Altman Weil Inc. "The opportunity for upside at many firms is limited, and these plaintiffs cases provide enormous upside opportunity."

Last year, Wiley Rein LLP, a Washington law firm that generally defends large companies, earned more than $200 million suing Research In Motion Ltd., maker of the BlackBerry, for patent infringement on behalf of the small company NTP Inc. But partner Richard Wiley says the firm doesn't want to make a "cottage industry" out of these cases. "We want to make sure people work on all cases, contingent or not, and not have associates say, 'I want to work only on contingent cases, so I can strike it rich.' "

Much of the tension comes from the partnership structure of large law firms. Lawyers typically bill for their time. During economic cycles, partners often carry each other financially as downturns affect various practice groups. But contingency-fee cases bring a new twist. The "agrarian plodders" who grind out steady hourly revenues can become distrustful -- and envious -- of "riverboat gamblers" within the firm who want to score oversize plaintiffs fees, says Mr. Bower, especially given that if the case goes for the defense, the firm ends up eating costs.

"If lawyers do really well [on a plaintiff's case] you can reward them in part, but they need to remember that the whole firm accepted the risk," says Robert Walters, a partner at Vinson & Elkins LLP in Dallas, which has a committee charged with vetting prospective contingency cases. "And if those lawyers strike out, you can't decimate them, either. You have to spread the risk out across the institution."

Losses happen. Last year, the Kansas City, Mo., firm Shook, Hardy & Bacon LLP lost a contingency-fee case after investing five years representing plaintiffs who sued Novartis AG's Gerber Products Co. and Playtex Products Inc., claiming they infringed a patent. B. Trent Webb, head of the firm's intellectual-property litigation group, says the loss wasn't a big financial blow, because the firm "ran [the case] extremely economically."

Divvying up winnings -- and dealing with the losses -- is less of an issue at firms that specialize in plaintiffs work. They tend to be smaller, with less overhead and fewer mouths to feed than defense firms. And they are more apt to let lawyers reap the big payoffs from their own cases.

Bryan Cave LLP of St. Louis formed a committee to vet contingency-fee cases in 2000. Some partners were leery, considering these cases too "anti-establishment," says partner Craig S. O'Dear. But resistance tapered off the next year, he says, when Bryan Cave won a $75 million plaintiffs verdict in a case on behalf of Biomedical Systems Corp. of St. Louis.

Gerard Carmody, the lead Bryan Cave lawyer in the case, says he sometimes felt like a marked man. "You had people in the corporate department and the banking group who said, 'I don't want to take a chance on Carmody spending a year on a case and coming up with a goose egg,' " he says.

Mr. Carmody, now at Carmody MacDonald P.C., a firm co-founded by his brother, says he thought he was entitled to a big bonus, but got only a "little bit of a bump." Many partners favored an "all for one and one for all" approach to the fee split, he says.

Before Exxon Valdez, Faegre & Benson had done some contingency-fee work, but nothing comparable in size, says Gerard Nolting, one of two Faegre partners who has worked on the case since the beginning. The firm got involved partly out of deference to partner Brian O'Neill, who had a "fire in his belly" to represent the plaintiffs, says firm Chairman Thomas Morgan.

In 1994, as the lead lawyer at trial in Alaska, Mr. O'Neill won a verdict that included $5 billion in punitive damages. After several appeals, the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco in December ruled Exxon Mobil must pay $2.5 billion in punitive damages, saying, "It is time for this protracted litigation to end." An Exxon Mobil spokesman says the company is hopeful the 9th Circuit will rehear the case.

So far, Faegre has collected about $1.5 million in Valdez fees -- due to a partial settlement in 1993 -- on an investment of around $28 million, says Mr. O'Neill.

That low level of return, he says, has strained his relationship with some partners. Mr. O'Neill says his in-laws once sat behind two of his colleagues at the symphony who "were complaining about how I'm wasting money in Alaska."

If the latest ruling holds, Mr. O'Neill estimates that Faegre could command about $110 million in fees. Firm chairman Mr. Morgan says some lawyers who worked on the case will get a bonus, but he won't say how much.

Mr. O'Neill hopes he'll get "a big hunk of cash at the end." But he also notes many people may benefit, including partners who have never worked on the case. "They haven't disrupted their lives and missed birthday after birthday. They haven't been on a plane to Alaska on Easter Sunday," Mr. O'Neill says.

Most of the firm's partners don't expect a big windfall from the case, Faegre partner John Hinderaker says. "I'm hoping to remodel my kitchen. That is the level of expectation I have."

Write to Nathan Koppel at nathan.koppel@wsj.com1

DOJ_NMG_0141569

Harsh Words Die Hard On The Web (WP)

By Ellen Nakashima

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

She graduated Phi Beta Kappa, has published in top legal journals and completed internships at leading institutions in her field. So when the Yale law student interviewed with 16 firms for a job this summer, she was concerned that she had only four call-backs. She was stunned when she had zero offers.

Though it is difficult to prove a direct link, the woman thinks she is a victim of a new form of reputation-maligning: online postings with offensive content and personal attacks that can be stored forever and are easily accessible through a Google search.

The woman and two others interviewed by The Washington Post learned from friends that they were the subject of derogatory chats on a widely read message board on AutoAdmit, run by a third-year law student at the University of Pennsylvania and a 23-year-old insurance agent. The women spoke on the condition of anonymity because they feared retribution online.

The law-school board, one of several message boards on AutoAdmit, bills itself as "the most prestigious law school admissions discussion board in the world." It contains many useful insights on schools and firms. But there are also hundreds of chats posted by anonymous users that feature derisive statements about women, gays, blacks, Asians and Jews. In scores of messages, the users disparage individuals by name or other personally identifying information. Some of the messages included false claims about sexual activity and diseases. To the targets' dismay, the comments bubble up through the Internet into the public domain via Google's powerful search engine.

The site's founder, Jarret Cohen, the insurance agent, said the site merely provides a forum for free speech. "I want it to be a place where people can express themselves freely, just as if they were to go to a town square and say whatever brilliant or foolish thoughts they have," Cohen said.

The students' tales reflect the pitfalls of popular social-networking sites and highlight how social and technological changes lead to new clashes between free speech and privacy. The chats are also a window into the character of a segment of students at leading law schools. Penn officials said they have known about the site and the complaints for two years but have no legal grounds to act against it. The site is not operated with school resources.

Nor is it the only forum for such discussions, but it may be the largest "and is certainly the highest profile," said David A. Hoffman, a Temple University law professor who has conducted research on AutoAdmit.

Employers, including law firms, frequently do Google searches as part of due diligence checks on prospective employees. According to a December survey by the Ponemon Institute, a privacy research organization, roughly half of U.S. hiring officials use the Internet in vetting job applications. About one-third of the searches yielded content used to deny a job, the survey said. The legal hiring market is very competitive. What could tip the balance is the appearance that a candidate is a lightning rod for controversy, said Mark Rasch, a Washington lawyer and consultant who specializes in Internet issues.

The trend has even spawned a new service, ReputationDefender, whose mission is to search for damaging content online and destroy it on behalf of clients. Generally, the law exempts site operators from liability for the content posted by others, though it does not prevent them from removing offensive items.

"For many people the Internet has become a scarlet letter, an albatross," said Michael Fertik, ReputationDefender's chief executive. The company is launching a campaign to get AutoAdmit to cleanse its site and encourage law schools to adopt a professional conduct code for students.

Kurt Opsahl, a staff attorney at the Electronic Frontier Foundation, a privacy and free speech advocacy group, said anonymous cyber-writers can be sued for defamation. A judge can require a Web site host or operator to disclose a user's identifying information. Also, he said, the Internet allows those who feel slandered to put forth their own point of view. "The cure to bad speech is more speech," he said.

The chats sometimes include photos taken from women's Facebook pages, and in the Yale student's case, one person threatened to sexually violate her. Another participant claimed to be the student, making it appear that she was taking part in the discussion.

"I didn't understand what I'd done to deserve it," said the student. "I also felt kind of scared because it was someone in my community who was threatening physical and sexual violence and I didn't know who."

The woman e-mailed the site's administrators and asked them to remove the material. She said she received no response. Then she tried contacting Google, which simply cited its policy that the Web site's administrator must remove the material to clear out the search results.

DOJ_NMG_0141570

AutoAdmit.com, which also uses the domain name xoxohth.com and which hosts Google-served ads, was launched in 2004. Cohen and his partner, Anthony Ciolli, cite First Amendment ideals. "We are very strong believers in the freedom of expression and the marketplace of ideas . . . and almost never censor content, no matter how abhorrent it may be," they wrote in a posting on someone else's blog. The vast majority of chat threads, they wrote, are school-related. "The only time you'll see 20 or so racist threads on the site is if you proactively search for them."

They said the success of the site's message boards -- they claim 800,000 to 1 million unique visitors a month -- owes to its free, anonymous exchange of ideas. "In fact, one finds overall a much deeper and much more mature level of insight in a community where the ugliest depths of human opinion are confronted, rather than ignored," they wrote.

One chat thread included a sexual joke about a female Holocaust victim.

In another comment, a user said a particular woman had no right to ask that the threads be removed. "If we want to objectify, criticize and [expletive] on [expletive] like her, we should be able to."

In another posting, a participant rejected the idea that photos be removed on moral grounds: "We're lawyers and lawyers-in-training, dude. Of course we follow the law, not morals."

"I definitely don't agree with a lot of the conduct on the board," Ciolli said in an interview. But, he said, only Cohen, who created the message board, has authority to have the comments removed. Cohen, in a separate interview, said he will not "selectively remove" offensive comments, and that when he has attempted to do so, he was threatened with litigation for "perceived inconsistencies."

Another Yale law student learned a month ago that her photographs were posted in an AutoAdmit chat that included her name and graphic discussion about her breasts. She was also featured in a separate contest site -- with links posted on AutoAdmit chats -- to select the "hottest" female law student at "Top 14" law schools, which nearly crashed because of heavy traffic. Eventually her photos and comments about her and other contestants were posted on more than a dozen chat threads, many of which were accessible through Google searches.

"I felt completely objectified," that woman said. It was, she said, "as if they're stealing part of my character from me." The woman, a Fulbright scholar who graduated summa cum laude, said she now fears going to the gym because people on the site encouraged classmates to take cellphone pictures of her.

Ciolli persuaded the contest site owner to let him shut down the "Top 14" for privacy concerns, Cohen said. "I think we deserve a golden star for what we did," Cohen said.

The two men said that some of the women who complain of being ridiculed on AutoAdmit invite attention by, for example, posting their photographs on other social networking sites, such as Facebook or MySpace.

Cohen said he no longer keeps identifying information on users because he does not want to encourage lawsuits and drive traffic away. Asked why posters could not use their real names, he said, "People would not have as much fun, frankly, if they had to worry about employers pulling up information on them."

One woman e-mailed the University of Pennsylvania Law School associate dean, Gary Clinton, in February to ask for his help in persuading Ciolli remove the offensive threads. Clinton told her that since he became aware of AutoAdmit two years ago, he has had "numerous conversations about it" with Penn officials. "I've learned that there appears to be little legal recourse that we have as an institution," he wrote. He said he has had several conversations with Ciolli and has "pointed out time and again how hurtful these ad hominem attacks can be to individuals, and have asked him to delete threads." The effort, he noted, "has been largely unsuccessful."

In a telephone interview, Clinton said the university's position has not changed. "We believe we don't have grounds under the university's code of conduct to proceed," he said.

Law Officers To Endorse Sen. McCain (HILL)

By Alexander Bolton

The Hill, March 7, 2007

The attorneys general of seven states, including the host of a pivotal presidential primary, will announce their support for Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) today, adding to the number of state leaders endorsing him over former district attorney Rudy Giuliani and the other Republican hopefuls in the race.

The top law enforcement officials from South Carolina, Michigan, Washington state, Utah, Alabama, Indiana, and North Dakota privately revealed their support of McCain during a meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General this week.

Three of the attorneys general endorsing McCain said the Arizona lawmaker is winning over the majority of Republican officials and former Bush campaign supporters in their home states.

DOJ_NMG_0141571

Five of the states represented are expected to hold early primaries next year. South Carolina will host one on Feb. 2 or earlier; Alabama and Utah have set elections for Feb. 5., and Michigan and North Dakota are expected to move up their primaries to join perhaps more than 20 other states on that date.

Two of the states, South Carolina and Michigan, are shaping up as pivotal contests between McCain and former Massachusetts Gov. Mitt Romney.

"Most of the establishment is for McCain. Most of the establishment last time was for Bush," said South Carolina Attorney General Henry McMaster, who pledged neutrality in 2000 when he served as state party chairman.

"It's the old Bush and McCain teams combined," said McMaster, who said that the senator has been able to consolidate the influential party members who split their allegiances six years ago. "The people who used to sit around the table and decide how much money would be raised for Bush in 2000 and those that sat around the McCain table, which was a smaller table in 2000, are all sitting around this table."

South Carolina is expected to play an important role next year as it did in 2000, when Bush captured the state's Republican establishment and social conservatives to beat McCain by 11 points, sapping the momentum McCain had generated by winning the New Hampshire primary.

Political analysts have described the South Carolina primary as a "conservative firewall" that could give a candidate a decisive edge over rivals. All three Republican frontrunners have drawn criticism for adopting centrist political positions in the past.

McMaster added that over half the members of the state House are supporting McCain, including state House Speaker Bobby Harrell.

He said the campaign has also attracted Bush fundraisers from the state, such as Edward Floyd, the president of Floyd Medical Associates, and attorney John Rainey.

Floyd and Rainey ranked among Bush's top national fundraisers in 2000, according to the Center for Responsive Politics, a non-partisan group that tracks campaign financing. Floyd was one of Bush's top money men in 2004.

Perhaps surprisingly, South Carolina Gov. Mark Sanford has held off from endorsing anyone, even though he lined up behind McCain in 2000. Conservative leaders have pushed Sanford to enter the race himself but so far he has declined, prompting speculation that he may be angling for the No. 2 spot on the GOP ticket.

Supporters will hold a "big fundraiser" for McCain in the state on Friday, said McMaster.

Attorney General Mike Cox, the highest-ranking Republican in Michigan, is also throwing his weight behind McCain. He said he will work to organize grassroots supporters and raise money for the campaign.

Michigan is the site of another expected showdown between Romney and McCain. It is considered friendly turf for McCain because he defeated Bush there in 2000. But Romney launched his campaign in Dearborn, Mich., on the strength of his family roots in the state. He was born in Detroit and his father served as governor in the 1960s.

Cox, who backed Bush in 2000, said that most of Bush's network is now aligned with McCain. He added that McCain won despite having fewer allies in the state.

"He didn't have that many," he said. "Most of the McCain people in 2007 that are there on the ground were strong George Bush people. It's a different year, it's a different cycle."

For example, Ronald Weiser, CEO of McKinley Associates, and Jim Nicholson, president of PVS Chemicals, two of Bush's "pioneer" fundraisers in 2000, are now on McCain's team, said Cox and an aide.

Cox described himself as the most identifiable conservative in Michigan.

"One of my missions is to point out how conservative [McCain] is compared to the other candidates in the race," he said. "McCain has turned out to be the most enduring conservative in the group, and he can win."

Attorney General Rob McKenna is the highest-ranking Republican in Washington state. He said the state's voters have a strong independent streak and would be attracted to McCain's reputation as an independent Republican.

He said the state will likely have its primary in early March and said it could play an important role if the Republican nomination is still contested after Feb. 5, which is on the verge of becoming the date of a de facto national primary.

McKenna said that the concentration of high-tech industry in Washington makes it a political fundraising destination and that Bush raised much money there for the 2000 election.

"He has a lot of key people from the Bush team in 2000," said McKenna, who added that McCain will soon make a fundraising trip to Washington.

Other attorneys general who are supporting McCain are Troy King of Alabama, Steve Carter of Indiana, Wayne Stenehjem of North Dakota and Mark Shurtleff of Utah.

For Whip Or 2008, It's A Lott/McCain Ticket (RC)

DOJ_NMG_0141572

By Erin P. Billings
Roll Call, March 7, 2007

Following crushing setbacks that could have sidelined their respective careers, Republican Sens. Trent Lott (Miss.) and John McCain (Ariz.) have put aside long-standing differences and become leading architects of each other's political resurrections.

In the process, Lott and McCain have created an influential network of Senate Republican allies who by circumstance or design are loyal to them both. In fact, many of Lott's strongest devotees also are backers of McCain's 2008 presidential bid, and vice versa.

When Lott plotted a return to the GOP leadership as Minority Whip in the fall, McCain served as one of his most eager promoters and helped count votes in the Mississippian's campaign. And it was Lott who more than a year ago became one of the first Senators to back McCain's bid for the presidential nomination and has since become one of the Arizonan's top Senate surrogates.

"They are sort of like ham and eggs," observed Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.).

But it wasn't always that way. Lott, the consummate leadership deal-maker, and McCain, long the meddlesome maverick, have engaged in bitter legislative battles over the years about high-profile issues such as campaign finance and earmark reform.

The two parted ways for a time after Lott successfully campaigned for GOP Whip in 1994 and moved for the first time into the Senate leadership. And in 2000, Lott opted to back then-Texas Gov. George W. Bush for the presidency over his Arizona Senate colleague.

"I didn't think the time was right for John then," Lott explained recently. "I thought that George W. Bush was the right man for the job at that time. But [McCain] has come back, better and stronger."

McCain doesn't dispute Lott's assessment, admitting he may not have been the best candidate during his earlier White House run: "First, I certainly didn't have the experience that I have now. And secondly, America was at peace in the 2000 campaign. [The Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks] changed everything."

Certainly, times have changed. Lott has spent months helping court Congressional and build national support for McCain's 2008 White House bid. He has advised McCain, spoken on his behalf and helped him set his campaign priorities.

Similarly, it was McCain who helped persuade Lott to not only run for a fourth term in 2006, but to make another play for the Republican leadership by seeking the No. 2 Whip job. McCain was a key whip in that race for Lott, who eked out a one-vote win over Sen. Lamar Alexander (R-Tenn.).

"We understand each other," McCain said. "When you know somebody for such a long period of time, you either grow closer or more distant. We've become closer and closer over the years."

Lott said both men share conservative ideological backgrounds and have been tested "warriors" under the glaring spotlight of the political stage. Lott said he's so fervently behind McCain's White House bid because he "wants to win the presidency" and believes the veteran Arizonan "is a very thoughtful leader possessing the kind of leadership qualities and character you need to be president."

"There's no quid pro quo there," Lott said.

McCain's and Lott's backgrounds have much in common. They share a Scottish heritage, and both families' genealogy and political connections trace back to the 1800s in Carroll County, Miss.

They are both creatures of Congress — Lott began in the House in 1973 and moved to the Senate in 1989, while McCain started his brief House tenure in 1983 and was elected to the Senate in 1986.

"Even when we've fought like cats and dogs, we've always kept our relationship — and let me tell you, it was testy at times," Lott said.

"We've had some of the best fights in the United States Senate," McCain offered.

Friends of the two men say both Lott and McCain have matured somewhat in recent years and developed a better understanding of one another following McCain's unsuccessful first bid for the White House and Lott's fall from leadership in 2002. Lott was forced out as Majority Leader on the heels of remarks that were perceived as racially insensitive at the 100th birthday of the late Sen. Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.).

Sources say it was then that Lott shared a common experience with the oft-rebellious McCain — understanding what it's like to be isolated from and ostracized by your colleagues.

"Trent Lott's wilderness years made him appreciate John McCain because he stayed with him during difficult times and Trent Lott saw a side of political life that he didn't see before," Graham said. "They've grown to really enjoy each other's company."

In his four years as a rank-and-file Senator, Lott returned to legislative deal-making, and had the freedom outside of the confines of leadership to speak his mind and even take on President Bush and members of his own party. Lott and McCain,

DOJ_NMG_0141573

meanwhile, found some areas of agreement, from their support for the Iraq War to certain aspects of lobby reform to fiscal discipline.

"They both learned a lot," noted a former Lott staffer. "People who are competitive or who have a drive don't like to lose. You can do one of two things: You can learn from your mistakes, or you can sulk and walk away. They both learned from their mistakes."

"There's something about people who were dealt a bad hand and overcome adversity and come back from that," added Sen. John Thune (R-S.D.). "It's quite a bond that's been built."

Thune counts himself among those Senators in both the Lott and McCain political camps. The conservative South Dakotan is not only Lott's chief deputy whip, he also is a newly announced backer of McCain for President.

McCain has yet to announce all of his Republican Senate endorsements, but among those already publicly in his camp are several GOP Members who aided Lott's quest for the Minority Whip post. They include Thune, Maine Sens. Olympia Snowe and Susan Collins, and Virginia Sen. John Warner.

More close Lott allies are expected to declare their support for McCain in the coming weeks.

"There is a natural overlap in these two groups," said one Republican Senator, speaking on the condition of anonymity.

This Senator said Lott and McCain have cultivated their influence in part by paying special attention to nurturing relationships with more junior Senators. Lott served as a mentor to those his junior over Senate rules and procedures, while McCain carried a policy portfolio of fiscal restraint that appealed to the up-and-comers, the Republican Senator said.

"There were a number of areas where those alliances proved to be mutually beneficial," the Senator said.

Warner, who also has had his friction with Lott at times over the years, said his shared support for both Lott and McCain is simple: "There's a common chemistry in both of them, and that's strong leadership. Without being presumptuous, I assume that's one of the reasons they admire each other. There's a common desire of Senators to form strong leadership."

Warner was one of the leading Senators who, along with McCain, helped form the "Gang of 14" that came together in 2005 to try to avert a showdown over Bush's judicial nominations. Lott was an original leader in the group but later stepped aside, leaving McCain and Warner to take the helm.

Snowe, who has known both Senators since the trio served in the House, said it is no accident that Lott and McCain have forged such a bond given their long track record together. After two-plus decades in the House and Senate, the duo has developed a level of trust that's all but unmatched on Capitol Hill these days, she said.

"That foundation is so crucial, and it's what gave impetus for Trent supporting John McCain for the presidency and for John to help Trent in his bid for Minority Whip," she said.

"There's a mutual bond there that supercedes any disagreements they've had over the years."

McCain Seeks Independents' Primary Votes (WT)

By Ralph Z. Hallow

The Washington Times, March 7, 2007

Sen. John McCain's campaign is mounting a stealth effort to change Republican presidential nomination rules in California to allow independents to vote in the Feb. 5 primary, party and campaign officials in the state have told The Washington Times.

The impact could be huge -- and potentially damaging to former Massachusetts Gov. Mitt Romney, currently the most acceptable to traditional-values voters among the three top-tier Republican presidential candidates.

"If California changes its delegate selection rules to allow independent voters to participate in the Republican primary, it would be very helpful for McCain and for Rudy Giuliani, who historically have done very well among independent voters," Federal Election Commissioner Michael E. Toner said.

An official with the Romney organization in California said McCain supporter Duff Sundheim, the former state Republican Party chairman and an ally of Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger, has been trying to line up votes for the rules change.

Several other state officials and campaign operatives independently reported receiving phone calls from Mr. Sundheim seeking support for the change.

Mr. Sundheim late last night denied that he is affiliated with or backing Mr. McCain but refused to answer when asked whether he was lining up support for a rules change. He did admit he was having discussions with state party Chairman Ron Nehring.

Officials from all three campaigns declined to discuss whether their candidates are working to change the rules.

"This is a state issue, and we will abide by whatever is decided," McCain spokesman Danny Diaz said. "Reading anything more into it is simply inaccurate."

A spokeswoman for Mr. Giuliani's campaign agreed that it is a state issue.

DOJ_NMG_0141574

"This ultimately is an issue for Californians to decide, and we will play by whatever rules the people of California decide upon," Maria Comella said.

A senior party official in California said a top McCain backer in the state told supporters the change would benefit the Arizona senator, who won the 2000 New Hampshire primary by drawing huge numbers of independents.

But other senior Republican officials maintain it also would help Mr. Giuliani, whose more liberal policy views most closely match the California independent voter profile.

California Republicans will select about 175 delegates on Feb. 5. Current rules do not allow voters who decline to state their party affiliation to participate in the selection of the presidential nominee.

California is a "winner-take-all" state when it comes to the Republican presidential nomination. This means the state awards three delegates for each of its congressional districts -- plus a bonus for the overall winner.

Therefore, a candidate could campaign heavily in districts with only a few hundred Republicans and win three delegates, the same number as another candidate who spends millions of dollars in a district with thousands of Republicans, noted Tim Morgan, Republican National Committee (RNC) treasurer and California RNC member.

If the rules change, Mr. McCain or Mr. Giuliani could go after even an independent-poor district and still win all three delegates from that district.

"Because of California's size and number of delegates to the national convention, this change could play the most significant role in determining who wins enough votes on Feb. 5 to be the Republican presidential nominee for 2008," said Jon Fleishman, Republican Party vice chairman for Southern California.

However, Mr. Fleishman thinks only voters who "bother to register as Republicans should have the right to select their party's presidential nominee."

In Washington, Mr. Morgan told The Times he thinks the changes now being pushed in his state could be accomplished simply enough, by a vote at the state party convention in September.

The RNC would not penalize California for the late change by reducing the number of eligible delegates, Mr. Morgan said, adding that the subject is under further legal review at national party headquarters.

A former top-ranking California Republican official now working for Mr. Romney said the McCain campaign is trying to change the rules because "it benefits McCain more than Giuliani because McCain is in the best position to go after independents. His whole campaign [is] built on that. Something that brings independents helps McCain more than Giuliani."

Mr. McCain has an impressive list of endorsements, according to a senior campaign official. Mr. Schwarzenegger is expected to announce his endorsement, as is Florida Gov. Charlie Crist and Texas Gov. Rick Perry -- representing three of the four most populous, delegate-rich states -- along with Oklahoma Sen. Tom Coburn, who is revered by many conservatives.

Can Rudy Get Past The First Date? (WP)

By Ruth Marcus

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

Does America's Mayor want to be America's President?

Poll after poll suggests that Rudy Giuliani has a serious shot at winning his party's nomination, and therefore the presidency, despite his abortion rights/gay rights/gun control baggage.

But listening to Giuliani's lackluster speech to a conservative group last week, I was not convinced that he craves the job -- or that he has a particular vision of what he'd do if he got it.

For the party of orderly succession, this is an odd presidential season. Not only is there no Republican heir apparent, none of the three leading contenders presents anywhere near a perfect fit with his party's base voters.

They are a political Goldilocks story, except that for many Republican voters, none of these three bears feels just right: Mitt Romney is too flip-floppy; Giuliani too liberal; John McCain too much of a maverick, simultaneously mistrusted for his previous deviations (campaign finance, immigration) and saddled with his embrace of an unpopular war.

As former Arkansas governor and long-shot presidential wannabe Mike Huckabee told the Conservative Political Action Conference about the 2008 campaign, "The theme might be 'Dude, Where's My Candidate?' "

Given the unsettled nature of the race, given his recent surge in the polls, given the suspicion with which many conservatives view him -- given all of that, you might have thought that Giuliani would have viewed the CPAC event as an important marketing opportunity. You might have thought he'd have put some effort into his speech -- maybe, even, have written a new one.

Indeed, the crowd packed into the Omni Shoreham ballroom and gathered around the television monitors outside seemed to be waiting to be wowed. But Giuliani didn't so much seize the opportunity as amble through it. He neither tossed the crowd red

DOJ_NMG_0141575

meat (conservative judges, maybe?) nor took on his vulnerabilities (the closest he came was to quote Ronald Reagan, "My 80 percent ally is not my 20 percent enemy") nor offered them much in the way of substance.

"Americans want to sell you something," Giuliani told the crowd. "That's what we want to do. We want to sell you a product." If so, Giuliani is no Ron Popeil.

Instead, he served up a pedestrian address padded with Reagan references (15, by my count) and platitudes. "The most important lesson that I learned from Ronald Reagan was the importance of optimistic leadership. I believe Ronald Reagan was able to achieve the things he was able to achieve because Ronald Reagan was a leader, which is a combination of being a visionary and a practical person who can achieve results."

Or, "We're not a country of one ethnic group. . . . We're all different religions. And we're all different races. Since we're not identified that way, what identifies us as Americans? The thing that identifies us as American are our ideas. And our ideas are wonderful ideas. And they're ideas that the world is moving toward."

And that was in just the first five minutes. Read the whole thing for yourself, at http://www.cpac.org/speeches/Giuliani.doc, and decide if I'm being unfair.

Even when discussing the issue on which he has every reason to shine -- the war on terrorism -- Giuliani was unimpressive, spouting tired Reaganisms ("peace through strength") and arguing a proposition that no one except the straw Democrats of Republican imaginings seems to debate much: that America must "remain on offense" against terrorists.

"We need an American president that understands the necessity of being on offense; needs to explain it to the rest of the world," he said. "And then, finally, what we all need to do is to understand that America has the right ideas. We should not be embarrassed about ourselves. We shouldn't have our heads down."

About Iraq -- nothing, other than to lampoon congressional Democrats for pushing a nonbinding resolution ("I understand that next week they're going to debate the entire week to see if they can make the World Series a nonbinding result.")

As to Giuliani's competition, McCain skipped CPAC; Romney gave a much meatier and more rousing speech -- and he started by bringing up on stage "my sweetheart," his first and only wife. (Take that, Mr. Thrice Married-Once Annulled-Once Divorced-Mayor.)

In the end, one mediocre speech to one crowd 10 months before the first vote is cast will not matter much -- unless it presages more uninspired Giuliani performances.

Time magazine, in one of the more peculiar poll questions ever asked, reported this week that Giuliani is the candidate voters think would do best at speed-dating (16 percent, to Barack Obama's 13 percent).

The 2008 campaign, though, will be more like an overly prolonged engagement -- and it's far from clear whether voters will still want to date the mayor once the getting-to-know-you stage is over.

marcusr@washpost.com

Baptist: Evangelicals Doubt Giuliani (BOS/AP)

By Rose French

The Boston Globe, March 7, 2007

NASHVILLE, Tenn. --A Southern Baptist leader said Tuesday that evangelical voters might tolerate a divorced presidential candidate, but they have deep doubts about GOP hopeful Rudy Giuliani, who has been married three times.

Richard Land, head of public policy for the Southern Baptist Convention, told The Associated Press that evangelicals believe the former New York City mayor showed a lack of character during his divorce from second wife, television personality Donna Hanover.

"I mean, this is divorce on steroids," Land said. "To publicly humiliate your wife in that way, and your children. That's rough. I think that's going to be an awfully hard sell, even if he weren't pro-choice and pro-gun control."

Giuliani married his longtime companion, Judith Nathan, in 2003. They had dated publicly while Giuliani was married to Hanover. His first marriage ended in an annulment.

A Giuliani staff member referred calls on Land's statement to Giuliani's exploratory committee, which did not have an immediate response Tuesday night.

Giuliani already has a challenge in winning over conservative who make up the GOP's base and view him with skepticism because of his moderate views on social issues such as gays, guns and abortion have been viewed as too liberal.

Land noted that Republican presidential candidate John McCain has been married twice, but said the Arizona senator has acknowledged his part in the failure of his first marriage.

"It's a molehill compared to Giuliani's mountain," Land said. "When you're a war hero (like McCain), you have less to prove on the character front."

DOJ_NMG_0141576

Many polls identify Giuliani as the front-runner in the Republican presidential primary, followed by McCain and former Massachusetts Gov. Mitt Romney.

Southern Baptists have been among the most vocal of conservative Christian groups in support of the Bush administration. But they and other evangelicals are struggling to find a consensus presidential candidate who embraces their stands against gay marriage and abortion.

Early Presidential Campaign Gains Considerable Interest (USAT)

By Jill Lawrence

USA Today, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON — Nearly half the country has given "quite a lot" of thought to a presidential election still 20 months away, according to a new USA TODAY/Gallup Poll that suggests high interest in a wide-open race already in full swing.

Among registered voters, one in five said they had "a good idea" whom they will support in 2008; an additional 55% said they have thought about the candidates but don't yet have a good idea. Asked about the early start to the campaign, 48% of poll respondents called it a good thing; 44% said it was a bad thing.

POLL RESULTS:Clinton, Giuliani still lead

Democrat Hillary Rodham Clinton and Republican Rudy Giuliani still lead their respective nomination races, the poll found.

Clinton, the New York senator, leads Illinois Sen. Barack Obama 36%-22%. Last month, she led 40%-21%. On the Republican side, former New York City mayor Giuliani led Arizona Sen. John McCain 44%-20%, up from 40%-24% last month.

Presidential hopefuls are campaigning and raising money at an accelerated pace this year to prepare for a front-loaded primary season. The first debates are scheduled for April 4-5 in Manchester, N.H. That's a month earlier than the first debate of the 2004 campaign, an event in South Carolina in May 2003. That was the earliest debate in presidential campaign history.

"Presidential campaigns are too long," newspaper columnist Lee Bandy wrote this week in The State of Columbia, S.C., under the headline "Voters Tune Out Campaigns."

South Carolina's Democratic primary is Jan. 29, and state Republicans are planning for Feb. 2. "You'd think the election is next week, judging by the number of candidates who've trekked through South Carolina since the beginning of the year," Bandy wrote.

Andrew Kohut, director of the non-partisan Pew Research Center, said the frenetic campaign activity is one reason for high public interest. He said it may also be fueled by concern about Iraq and "an appetite for change" in the White House. Another possible reason is a diverse field of candidates that includes a woman (Clinton), an African-American (Obama), a Hispanic (New Mexico Gov. Bill Richardson, a Democrat) and a Mormon (Republican Mitt Romney, former governor of Massachusetts).

In a Pew poll last month, 55% said they were following news about candidates for the 2008 election very or fairly closely. That compares with 42% in January 2003.

The USA TODAY/Gallup Poll, conducted the weekend after the Academy Awards, showed a mini-resurgence for Al Gore after An Inconvenient Truth won the Oscar for best documentary. The honor for Gore's global-warming slide show put him in the news and solidified his spot in the top tier of a contest he says he has no plans to enter.

The former vice president trailed Clinton and Obama but drew twice as much support as fourth-place finisher John Edwards, the former North Carolina senator.

The poll showed that 58% of registered voters had a favorable opinion of Obama. That put him higher than Clinton (54%), Edwards (51%) and Gore (55%). Giuliani was highest of all the major candidates at 64%. Former House speaker Newt Gingrich and Romney were in a virtual tie for third among Republicans. Gingrich, who says he'll decide whether to run this fall, would face a challenge: 29% viewed him favorably, 49% unfavorably.

Romney was viewed favorably by 23% and has room to improve. Although he has been campaigning for months, four in 10 people said they had never heard of him.

Obama's Selma Bounce (HILL)

By Dick Morris

The Hill, March 7, 2007

Will March 4, 2007, the 42nd anniversary of the Selma, Ala., march for voting rights, propel Sen. Barack Obama's (D-Ill.) presidential candidacy with the same force that Sept. 11, 2004 energized George W. Bush's pursuit of a second term? The day clearly belonged to Obama, despite the efforts of both Hillary and Bill to turn it into Clinton Day. Obama's speech was inspirational, challenging African-Americans to assume responsibility and participate in the political process. By contrast, Hillary's speech, replete with a phony Southern drawl — the same one she used to effect in Arkansas — smacked of pandering. But Hillary's attempt to paint the events in Selma as seminal in her ability to run for president seemed forced, artificial, and contrived.

DOJ_NMG_0141577

She appeared to have confused the efforts of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. with those of Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton and to have mixed up the 15th and 19th amendments to the Constitution.

But Obama's speech seared right through to the root of the American conscience. The spectacle of an African-American running for president and speaking on the site of a 42-year-old battlefield where the very right of blacks to vote was at issue could not but inspire everyone who watched it. The effect on the polls may be significant.

At the back of the minds of every voter lurks the idea that beyond parties and candidates and issues, the election of 2008 is destined to be about making history. Whether it results in the nomination and election of the first woman or the first black, and regardless of the ultimate fate of the president it elects, it will be a watershed. Watching the events in Selma, one cannot escape the conclusion that if Obama were to be elected president of the United States, it would put a period on the sorriest chapter in American history — the one that began when the first slaves were offloaded at Jamestown. The very fact of a black president would suddenly provide tens of millions of African-American children with a role model and a guide. No longer would they look to athletes or rappers or actors for inspiration. They could behold a president.

Even those of us who still believe that Obama is too inexperienced to serve successfully as president have to be impressed nevertheless by his eloquence, poise, charisma, and stage presence. And we all must concede that the very fact of his election would do much to end racial division in America. The historic nature of the Obama quest for the White House was clear to anyone watching Sunday's ceremonies at Selma.

So what will be the political impact of this anniversary?

It might be enough to permit Obama to challenge Hillary for first place. Previous polling has shown a real elasticity in the Democratic race that is not apparent in the Republican contest. Lacking any real opponent — with Gingrich out, Romney hobbled, and McCain fading — Giuliani may just hold onto his lead until a real right-wing challenger emerges. But Obama's move up in the polls last week suggests a volatility in the Democratic contest that is bad news for Hillary. It may well be that the lead will change hands several times as the emotional significance of a first woman duels with that of a first black and captures the imagination of each constituency.

Left behind is, of course, John Edwards. His anti-war positioning advantage has eroded as Obama has moved wisely to preempt his turf. His healthcare proposal, while sweeping and likely popular among Democrats, seems to offer a pale comparison to the emotional epiphany of breaking down gender or racial barriers.

But, ultimately, the challenge remains for Obama and for Hillary to flesh out their uniqueness with issue positions that distinguish them. Neither of these two Democrats, nor Giuliani for that matter, can cruise to the nomination on the strength of gender, race, past heroism, or biography. Their success will hinge on their ability to translate who they are into what they are for. How does being African-American help Obama to address the problems of poverty that plague us? How does Hillary's gender make her sensitive to the feminization of poverty? And how is Giuliani's heroism relevant to the policy choices of our times? These three candidates — likely one of whom will be president — must answer these questions or watch their candidacies and the boomlets that they have ignited flare out and go cold over time.

Morris, a former political adviser to Sen. Trent Lott (R-Miss.) and President Bill Clinton, is the author of Condi vs. Hillary: The Next Great Presidential Race. To get all of Dick Morris's and Eileen McGann's columns for free by email, go to www.dickmorris.com.

Obama's Short Tenure Seen As Plus (WT)

By Brian Debose

The Washington Times, March 7, 2007

The 2008 road to the White House is filled with pitfalls for senators; specifically, their voting records -- a particularly acute problem for Democrats who approved the Iraq war.

But Sen. Barack Obama has served in the Senate for only two years, and some analysts say the Illinois Democrat's lack of a voting record may uniquely benefit his presidential campaign.

"Everyone thinks that he agrees with them or that they agree with him because he does not have an extensive record to play against, and he is a really good listener," said Stephen Hess, professor of political science at George Washington University and senior fellow in governance studies at the Brookings Institution.

But Mr. Obama's record is longer in the Illinois state Senate, where he served for eight years. There, he co-authored bills extending tax benefits to low-income families, making health insurance more affordable, and increasing funding for AIDS prevention and care programs.

"He inspires hope that we can get past the days of bickering and fighting that [have] controlled the debate in Washington, and I think he has proven he can work across party lines," said Seth Tobey, a University of Iowa law student who founded Independents for Obama.

DOJ_NMG_0141578

However, Mr. Obama has little hope of swaying pro-life advocates because he has made his pro-choice views very clear and voted accordingly. For example, he once voted against a state Senate bill to provide medical care to unborn babies who survive an abortion, saying it would create a loophole to make abortion illegal.

Likewise, gun rights advocates view Mr. Obama as a threat, but concede there are some things in his voting record that make him less unattractive than the other Democrats in the race.

"He was consistently an F rating when he ran for [the U.S.] Senate and when he was in the state Senate," said Chris W. Cox, chief lobbyist for the National Rifle Association. "Basically, after all the talk recently about Obama and Hillary [Rodham Clinton], they do have one thing in common and that is the zeal with which they have supported the gun-control movement."

While in the state Senate, Mr. Obama voted against a bill that would have allowed self-defense to be used as a mitigating argument against charges of illegal firearms possession in cases where a person shot a home intruder using a banned handgun. Mr. Obama said it would effectively override the local government's authority -- particularly Chicago, portions of which he represented -- to limit guns in its jurisdiction.

Mr. Cox said Mr. Obama also will need to explain his opposition to the Lawful Commerce in Arms Act, which protected gun manufacturers and dealers from frivolous lawsuits, and his vote in support of a ban on certain types of deer-hunting ammunition.

Mr. Cox did soften his tone somewhat when asked to compare Mr. Obama to his chief rival, Mrs. Clinton, as well as other Democratic presidential candidates, noting his vote in favor of allowing retired police and military officers to carry concealed weapons.

"He did support the bill to stop the post-[Hurricane] Katrina gun-confiscation legislation, which passed 84-16, but Hillary Clinton voted against it as one of the 16," he said.

But the biggest issue dogging the leading candidates from both parties is the vote authorizing what Mr. Obama has called the "stupid war" in Iraq.

Former New York Mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani has nearly doubled his lead in the past month over his chief Republican rival, Sen. John McCain of Arizona, a supporter of the war, and Mrs. Clinton has lost some momentum in the polls as voters on the campaign trail have repeatedly asked her to explain her vote authorizing the war.

All the while, Mr. Obama has been able to call himself the first to oppose the war, with little retort from his rivals.

"He is a natural candidate, and he is a lot like John F. Kennedy in that he was a lightweight politically, but ended up winning the presidency, and I think Barack can do the same thing," said Morris L. Reid, managing director of Westin Rinehart, a political communications firm. "He will put the time in and roll up his sleeves and, I think, will prove the naysayers wrong."

Think Naughty, Think Small, Think Not (NYT)

By Judith Warner

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

Ann Coulter's use of the epithet "faggot" to slur Democratic presidential candidate John Edwards last week took me back to the schoolyards of the 1970s, when Coulter and I were both young.

There were plenty of words like "faggot" being thrown around back then. There was "faggoty," for example. "Retard." And "spaz" — or "total spaz," the rhythm of which rang through her words last year, when Coulter dismissed Al Gore on MSNBC as a "total fag."

The world of playground insults hasn't altered much since Coulter's schooldays, but the larger world has changed a bit. She made her remarks during a major gathering of conservatives in Washington that drew most of the major Republican presidential candidates, and commentators of the left, right and center soundly denounced her.

Even Michelle Malkin, Coulter's fellow pinup girl on the Clare Booth Luce Policy Institute's 2007 "Great American Conservative Women" calendar, blasted her words as "rhetorical fragging" and a "tired old schtick."

We shouldn't be content, though, to let it go at that.

Leaving the issue of not-so-latent homophobia aside — dwelling upon it, in this context, is a matter of shooting ducks in a barrel — what I found particularly shocking in Coulter's comments was their studied juvenility, the sheer idiocy of their language. "Faggot" and "total fag," like other political pearls of our time — such as "bring it on" and "girlie men" — are just epoch-making in their stupidity. In fact, they sound like lines out of Mike Judge's 2006 film "Idiocracy," a political satire that I rented a few months ago and can't seem to get out of my mind.

In "Idiocracy," a man the Pentagon has chosen for his perfectly average intelligence is sent into the future and finds the America of 500 years hence inhabited by people so grotesquely moronic that they can barely grunt utterances greater than "Man, whatever!"

DOJ_NMG_0141579

Those future Americans have, however, held on to a full arsenal of obscenities and repeatedly tell the hero, who speaks in full sentences, "You talk like a fag." As the film plays out, it's the People vs. the Fag — the very dynamic that Coulter establishes when she connects to her audience via their inner 13-year-olds.

All this led me this week to think of Frank Luntz, the hot political consultant and wordsmith who wrote the lyrics for the 1994 Republican revolution. In his new book, "Words That Work: It's Not What You Say, It's What People Hear," Luntz puts forth the argument that using the "uplifting, ennobling tone" of famed political scribes like Ted Sorenson and Peggy Noonan is not the best way to capture the attention of Americans today. Instead, to communicate with the people — the real people of "small town, middle America" — and to speak straight to their hearts, minds and entrails, you've got to put "yourself right into your listener's shoes."

In other words, think small. "Use Small Words" is Rule 1 of his strategy for successful communication. Rule 2: "Use Short Sentences."

Luntz has a doctorate from Oxford; Coulter has degrees from Cornell and the University of Michigan Law School. Conservatives generally like to run with the idea that liberals are elitists, living "in a world of only Malibu and East Hampton," as Coulter's recent blog posting on the "crock" of global warming put it. But isn't there something elitist, if not wrong, I wondered aloud to Luntz, about condescending to — or coddling or enabling — the imagined verbal limitations of the less-educated "other"?

Luntz did not much appreciate the question.

"It's not condescending — it's pandering," he said of Coulter's most recent performance. "Everything about the book says what she did was not just wrong but reprehensible. Those aren't words that work. She broke every rule."

"God, I really hate it every time she speaks," he fumed. And, he added, if I were to even think of mentioning him in the same breath as her, "I will really, seriously raise hell."

At a Conservative Women's Network lunch at the Heritage Foundation last week, a question was raised, over dessert, about how conservative women should deal, "as women," if Hillary Clinton wins the Democratic nomination for president. The guest speaker, Cleta Mitchell, a lawyer in Washington, hemmed and hawed, shared some thoughts about Wellesley College and Barbara Bush, blushed, then concluded, "We'll let the redneck guys who just aren't ready to vote for a female commander in chief take care of the woman thing."

Sounds like a plan. Sounds to me, too, like the Republican noise machine may just have a monkey wrench in its machinery.

Lawmakers Scrutinize Fees For 401(k) Plans (WP)

By Kathleen Day

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

Workers are being overcharged tens of billions of dollars a year in unnecessary and often hidden fees imposed on popular, company-sponsored retirement savings plans known as 401(k)s, financial experts told a congressional committee yesterday.

Mutual funds and other professional investment firms often charge fees totaling 3 percent to 5 percent of the assets they manage, when 1.5 percent would be more appropriate, Matthew D. Hutcheson, an independent consultant on pension fees, told the House Education and Labor Committee.

An excess charge of just 1 percent can seriously erode retirement money, retirement planner Stephen J. Butler testified. A couple investing $10,000 a year over 30 years and earning 10 percent, for example, would have more than $1.9 million for retirement at the end of that time. But that sum would be reduced by $355,395 -- to just under $1.6 million -- if that money earned one percentage point less, or 9 percent a year.

Fees often are scattered across written materials, or sometimes not reported at all, making it difficult for employers and consumers to comparison shop, according to testimony from Hutcheson and others, including an official from the Government Accountability Office, the research arm of Congress.

The hearing comes as the new Congress, now controlled by Democrats, is applying greater scrutiny to the financial services industry, especially to how it charges and discloses fees on a variety of products, including credit cards and home loans.

The hearing was the first of two planned this year by the committee's chairman, Rep. George Miller (D-Calif.), to determine if the Labor Department is adequately overseeing the 401(k) industry and to help craft legislation requiring money managers to fully disclose what they charge and to manage 401(k) plans to maximize returns for retirees.

"We have to ask whether all these fees are necessary, and we have to examine whether they are undermining workers' retirement security," Miller said.

The mutual fund industry, which manages half of all 401(k) money, and the bank and insurance industries, which manage most of the rest, disagree with those who say their fees are too high, hard to find or hidden.

DOJ_NMG_0141580

"We have looked at fees for mutual funds in 401(k)s, and those fees are falling," said Mike McNamee, spokesman for the Investment Company Institute, the lobby group for mutual fund managers. He said that fees typically are "on the order of 1 percent," including commissions. He said all fees are disclosed in each fund's prospectus -- management fees in what is called a fee table, and brokers commissions and trading costs in a separate section.

The hearing follows a GAO report last November that concluded that workers often can't understand, or in some cases can't find out, what fees they pay to have their 401(k) money managed.

The GAO said the Labor Department, which regulates company-sponsored retirement plans, has some power to make the financial industry disclose more and to do so in simpler, easy-to-understand language. But it recommended that Congress amend current law to require the industry to disclose all fees and charges and also potential conflicts of interest.

The issue has become more important as more Americans have come to rely on 401(k)s as a primary nest egg. In the mid-1980s fewer than 8 million workers participated in such plans, which totaled $100 billion. Today more than 47 million workers have more than $2 trillion invested in these plans. To encourage Americans to save more for retirement, Congress passed legislation last year to allow employers to automatically enroll workers in 401(k) plans, a change financial planners say already has accelerated workers' participation.

Acting Assistant Secretary of Labor Bradford P. Campbell said in an interview this week that he thinks the agency has all the legal authority it needs to make investment companies provide fuller and more understandable disclosures about fees.

The department, working closely with industry, last year announced a three-pronged plan he said is intended to lead to full fee disclosure by investment firms in their annual reports filed with the government, in their contracts with employers and in publications given to workers. But the first phase of the plan won't begin for several months, and the final phase might not become effective for several years.

It's Chamber Vs. Chamber In Lawsuit Over Trademark (HILL)

By Alexander Bolton And Jim Snyder

The Hill, March 7, 2007

Two well-known business trade associations are embroiled in a legal battle that could affect which will represent Hispanic businesses, a rising political and economic force, in Washington.

The U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce is accusing its one-time ally, the much larger U.S. Chamber of Commerce, of trying to diminish its influence with Latino business leaders through a trademark fight over the right to use the words "United States" and "chamber of commerce." The U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce is also claiming that the other Chamber has tried to poach its members by offering them free memberships.

The U.S. Chamber, the nation's leading business trade group, is an ardent advocate for competition and a liberal immigration policy. But critics contend that in its fight with the rival chamber, it is motivated by fear both of competition and a Hispanic invasion of its turf.

"We believe that like any other business, they see the opportunity there may be to extend their membership in the Latino community; that's fair game," said David Lizarraga, chairman of the U.S. Hispanic chamber. "But they see us as an obstacle. If they remove us from the playing field, then it is completely open."

The U.S. Chamber has filed two lawsuits against the U.S. Hispanic chamber and the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce Foundation for trademark infringement. The suits claim that the U.S. Chamber owns the words "United States" and "Chamber of Commerce" exclusively, according to a U.S. Hispanic chamber lawyer who summarized the cases.

If successful, the litigation would force the U.S. Hispanic chamber to drop "United States" and "Chamber of Commerce" from its name.

But Stephen Bokat, senior vice president and general counsel at the U.S. Chamber, denies the suggestion that it is trying to squash a competitor.

"That's simply untrue," he said. "We're just trying to protect our name because we're worried that if too many people use our name we will lose the right [to protect against] others from encroaching on the use of U.S. Chamber of Commerce."

Bokat said his association offered to license its name to the U.S. Hispanic chamber for a nominal sum and "they refused."

"We had no intention of taking their name, their members or anything else," said Bokat.

In the last three years, the Hispanic chamber has more than doubled its membership, from 110 member groups to nearly 250.

Its $15 million budget is a fraction of what the U.S. Chamber has. The latter spent more than $30 million just lobbying in the second half of 2006.

The Hispanic chamber is also growing in visibility. This week President Bush addressed a three-day gathering it organized for Hispanic business leaders in Washington.

DOJ_NMG_0141581

"We're seeing membership growing all over the United States," said Lizarraga. "Maybe we're being seen for the first time as posing a threat."

Hispanic chamber officials have decided to use the occasion of this week's national legislative conference to go public with their trademark fight. They will hold a press conference this afternoon in the Rayburn House office building with members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus to protest their rival's litigation.

The winner could claim to be the main Washington representative of a community projected to reach $1 trillion in total buying power within two years.

"They want to remove us from the table. … This is about power and influence and money," said Melinda Guzman, the Hispanic chamber's general counsel. "This is about eliminating potential competition in a huge and … significant population."

The two chambers share political philosophies on a variety of issues such as immigration reform that includes a guest worker program. But they are not formally affiliated with one another.

For years, the two groups peacefully coexisted. The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce is 27 years old, and its affiliated foundation has been around for 14 years.

But in 2002, the U.S. Chamber accused the United States Hispanic Chamber of Commerce from trademark infringement.

A year earlier the Hispanic chamber had filed to register its logo, which includes the group's full name, with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

That dispute is expected to go to trial next year.

Hispanic officials insist the larger Chamber sees the economic writing on the wall, and doesn't want competition to represent Hispanic businesses.

Pew Hispanic Center projects the total U.S. Hispanic market to reach $1 trillion by the end of 2008. Lizarraga said that Hispanic small businesses are growing twice as fast as other small businesses.

"It's obvious that our influence is growing," said Lizarraga.

Despite the legal battle, Hispanic chamber officials say they have attempted to open up a dialogue with the U.S. Chamber. The Hispanic chamber has, for example, called on the U.S. Chamber to put more Hispanic executives on its board.

But so far, they say Chamber President and CEO Thomas Donohue has rebuffed their efforts to create a dialogue.

Bokat said he knew of no outreach efforts by the Hispanic chamber. He added that Harry Alford, the president of the National Black Chamber of Commerce, was a member of his association's board of directors and it made no sense that Hispanic leaders would be excluded.

Both the growing economic power and the sheer size of the Hispanic population has attracted more than lobbyists, of course. Politicians are increasingly interested in reaching out to the Hispanic community.

"We are getting more attention from everybody," said Lizarraga. "Any corporation that doesn't target this $1 trillion market that will emerge in the next two years as an opportunity for growth isn't going to grow."

Particularly enticing to businesses, Lizarraga said, is that Latino market is largely untapped, whereas other ethic–based markets are mature.

How Can U.S. Stay On Top Of The World? (USAT)

By Antoine Van Agtmael

USA Today, March 7, 2007

South Korean car maker Hyundai recently had to deny newspaper reports that it is a leading candidate to take over Chrysler. True or not, it already has a $1.1 billion plant in Alabama and now beats Toyota in performance quality, according to the J.D. Power survey. Less than five years ago it was the joke of a Jay Leno show.

Hyundai is just one of the many profitable firms in emerging markets that produce just about everything consumers consume. Within hours of Apple CEO Steve Jobs' recent unveiling of the stylish new iPhone, shares in Taiwanese electronics giant Hon Hai Precision Industry shot up. Founded in 1974 as a marginal manufacturer of TV-set-tuning knobs, Hon Hai today produces PCs for Hewlett-Packard and Dell, PlayStation game consoles for Sony, motherboards for Intel, cellphone handsets for Nokia and Motorola, and now Apple's new iPhone. Other examples can be found everywhere.

While our attention was focused on the "new economy" a few years ago, "new economies" quietly stole the show. We are in the midst of the greatest shift in the global economy since the Industrial Revolution. This time, the economic epicenter is shifting away from the developed world to emerging markets in Asia, Eastern Europe, the Middle East and Latin America.

Sharp moves in the Dow Jones used to scare or exhilarate investors worldwide. Last week's 416-point drop in the U.S. stock market, together with a sudden reversal in markets around the globe, was the first time that a sell-off in China triggered such a major loss in market values — one that was far larger than the entire Chinese market. It was not only an overdue

DOJ_NMG_0141582

reminder that investors get scared from time to time — usually after periods of over-enthusiasm — but also demonstrated the dramatic and growing impact of what I call the "Emerging Markets Century."

What are we in the USA and the rest of the developed world to make of the fact that so much of what we consume is produced in the former Third World? One thing is that America (but also Europe and Japan) will need to get used to the idea that we are no longer the center of the economic and political universe. Even more important, we should resist the knee-jerk reaction of protectionism that would likely stifle innovation.

Yet, in the USA, we have been slow to accept this new reality. Countries such as Mexico, South Korea and Russia are no longer basket cases in need of rescue. Emerging markets now own three-quarters of the world's foreign exchange reserves, and their purchases influence U.S. mortgage rates. The brain drain is reversing just as budget and current account deficits (the broadest measure of a nation's trade gap) have crossed over into the developed world.

The world is not flat; it is tilting, with the USA rapidly moving from unquestioned dominance to greater dependence. And this is only the beginning. Twenty-five years from now, emerging markets will make up more than half of the global economy (up from 21% today) as the General Electrics and Microsofts of the future will increasingly hail from these new economies.

More than ever, the global economy is not a zero-sum game. More handsets, refrigerators and beer are sold in emerging markets than in mature markets. U.S. exports to emerging markets have increased 338% over the past 20 years, much faster than domestic demand. One billion new consumers and investors will turn many emerging markets into middle-class economies. Smart American corporations are already seeking their growth in emerging markets. GE plans to double its sales in emerging markets from 15% to 30% by 2010. Goldman Sachs built an important franchise in China. Dell and GM increasingly produce in India and China for the local markets.

But that is clearly not enough to keep our competitive edge. Many more corporations should develop a clear emerging-markets strategy, embed their young managers with local families (as Procter & Gamble already does), build crucial local relationships, establish international focus groups to tailor products to local tastes, and form business alliances with this new breed of companies. And our universities should focus more on creative problem solving and integrate study and work experience abroad if we want students to be comfortable with foreign languages and cultures.

When we look at history, a creative response has often succeeded where protectionism has failed. President Kennedy's inspiring call to put a man on the moon when Russia seemed to be "winning" provided the United States decades of technological superiority. Today, leading U.S. universities remain the best, while creative companies such as Google and Apple are more than competitive.

As a nation, we need a "National Competitiveness" campaign that sets ambitious goals such as developing a successor to the internal-combustion engine, but also tackles legacy issues (high cost of health and pension benefits for current, older and retired workers), places more emphasis on creativity in education and gives infrastructure a much-needed face lift. The choice between protectionism and a creative response to the tectonic shift in the global economy (and global power) could well become one of the key issues in the next presidential campaign. Instead of complaining and agonizing about this new competitive threat, our focus should be on turning it into an exciting opportunity.

Antoine van Agtmael is chairman and CEO of Emerging Markets Management, LLC. He recently published The Emerging Markets Century: How A New Breed of World-Class Companies is Overtaking the World.

'Family Values' Chutzpah (WP)

By Harold Meyerson

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

As conservatives tell the tale, the decline of the American family, the rise in divorce rates, the number of children born out of wedlock all can be traced to the pernicious influence of one decade in American history: the '60s.

The conservatives are right that one decade, at least in its metaphoric significance, can encapsulate the causes for the family's decline. But they've misidentified the decade. It's not the permissive '60s. It's the Reagan '80s.

In Saturday's Post, reporter Blaine Harden took a hard look at the erosion of what we have long taken to be the model American family -- married couples with children -- and discovered that while this decline hasn't really afflicted college-educated professionals, it is the curse of the working class. The percentage of households that are married couples with children has hit an all-time low (at least, the lowest since the Census Bureau started measuring such things): 23.7 percent. That's about half the level that marrieds-with-children constituted at the end of the Ozzie-and-Harriet '50s.

Now, I'm not a scholar of the sitcom, but I did watch "The Adventures of Ozzie and Harriet" as a child, marveling that anything labeled "Adventures" could be so dull. And I don't recall a single episode in which the family had to do without because Ozzie had lost his job or missed taking David or Ricky to the doctor for fear he couldn't pay for it.

DOJ_NMG_0141583

Which may explain why the Ozzie and Harriet family -- modified by feminism, since Harriet now holds down a job, too -- still rolls along within the upper-middle class but has become much harder to find in working-class America, where cohabitation without marriage has increasingly become the norm. Taking into account all households, married couples with children are twice as likely to be in the top 20 percent of incomes, Harden reported. Their incomes have increased 59 percent over the past 30 years, while households overall have experienced just a 44 percent increase.

To be sure, the '60s, with its assaults on traditional authority, played some role in weakening the traditional family.

But its message was sounded loudest and clearest on elite college campuses, whose graduates were nonetheless the group most likely to have stable marriages. Then again, they were also the group most likely to have stable careers.

They enjoyed financial stability; they could plan for the future.

Such was not the case for working-class Americans. Over the past 35 years, the massive changes in the U.S. economy have largely condemned American workers to lives of economic insecurity. No longer can the worker count on a steady job for a single employer who provides a paycheck and health and retirement benefits, too. Over the past three decades, workers' individual annual income fluctuations have consistently increased, while their aggregate income has stagnated. In the brave new economy of outsourced jobs and short-term gigs and on-again, off-again health coverage, American workers cannot rationally plan their economic futures. And with each passing year, as their level of economic security declines, so does their entry into marriage.

Yet the very conservatives who marvel at the efficiency of our new, more mobile economy and extol the "flexibility" of our workforce decry the flexibility of the personal lives of American workers. The right-wing ideologues who have championed outsourcing, offshoring and union-busting, who have celebrated the same changes that have condemned American workers to lives of financial instability, piously lament the decline of family stability that has followed these economic changes as the night the day.

American conservatism is a house divided against itself. It applauds the radicalism of the economic changes of the past four decades -- the dismantling, say, of the American steel industry (and the job and income security that it once provided) in the cause of greater efficiency. It decries the decline of social and familial stability over that time -- the traditional, married working-class families, say, that once filled all those churches in the hills and hollows in what is now the smaller, post-working-class Pittsburgh.

Problem is, disperse a vibrant working-class community in America and you disperse the vibrant working-class family.

Which is how American conservatism became the primary author of the very social disorder that it routinely rails against, and that Republicans have the gall to run against.

The party of family values? Please. If that's the banner that Republicans continue to wave, then they should certainly make Rudy Giuliani, who couldn't bestir himself to attend his son's high school graduation or his daughter's high school plays, their presidential nominee. No candidate could better personify the sham that is Republicans' and conservatives' concern for the American family.

meyersonh@washpost.com

US Looks To Brazil To Fuel Energy Revolution (FT)

By Jonathan Wheatley

Financial Times, March 7, 2007

When George W. Bush arrives in Brazil on Thursday, he will bring with him an offer to promote biofuels in oil-dependant countries just as Brazil is gripped by green energy fever.

Over the next six years, Brazil expects 77 new sugar or alcohol (both are raw ingredients for biofuels) plants to be built – a rate of more than one a month. According to Unica, the industry association, investments already under way amount to $14.6bn. Throughout its rich agricultural heartland, soya and other crops are being torn out and replaced by sugar cane.

Most investment is by local companies but foreigners are also arriving. Sempra Energy of the US has agreed, with local partners, to build 12 alcohol refineries in northern Brazil for $4.2bn. Others already committed include Cargill of the US, Louis Dreyfus of France, the Noble group of Singapore and Infinity Bio-Energy of the UK.

US officials, seeking a way to reach out to the dominant economy of South America and undercut the regional impact of Venezuela's oil diplomacy, think they have found it in biofuels.

Brazil has the potential to be the world's leading producer. Establishing a partnership now would give the US the significance in the region it has gradually lost since talk of a US-led Free Trade Area of the Americas fizzled out a few years ago.

In spite of the widespread optimism, the outlook for Brazil's ethanol industry seems uncertain. "It's euphoria," says Roberto Giannetti da Fonseca of Ethanol Trading, which represents more than 200 Brazilian producers. "People seem to be investing without really studying what's going on."

DOJ_NMG_0141584

The US and Brazil in equal measure between them produce about 72 per cent of the world's ethanol. However, Brazil is much more efficient than the US, where ethanol is made exclusively from maize. Production per hectare is twice that in the US and, per unit of energy used from planting to processing, it is more than five times more efficient.

Yet it is unclear what Brazil will do with its expected increase in production. Its own market is by far the world's most biofueled: ethanol is added to gasoline at 23 per cent of volume and pure ethanol is universally available as an alternative. Some 80 per cent of all new cars in Brazil can run on gasoline or ethanol or any mixture of the two.

If other countries were to follow Brazil's lead, its exporters' futures would be secure. But the refusal of governments in Europe and the US to expose their much less efficient producers to Brazilian competition means an export boom cannot be expected.

Last year, Brazil exported more than 430m gallons of ethanol to the US – a six-fold leap over 2005 – in spite of an import tariff of 54 cents per gallon and subsidies to US producers of 51 cents per gallon. But last year's surge was due to a shortage in the US that local producers will fill this year. Brazilian exports are due to slump.

The US has made it clear that discussing import tariffs is not on Mr Bush's agenda, and the European Union is no less intransigent, but Washington will be able to offer co-operation on research into ethanol and cellulose-based fuels made from a more diverse range of materials.

That development is still 10 to 15 years from commercial reality but will yield much more environmentally-friendly fuels and will also offer Brazil huge natural advantages.

The two will also discuss setting international standards to develop ethanol as a commodity, and joint initiatives to develop the industry in Peru, Colombia, Central America and the Caribbean.

But as Marcos Jank of Icone, a trade think-tank in São Paulo, points out, any move on tariffs is a matter for Congress and the short-term outcome of Mr Bush's visit is likely to be limited. "But we think tariffs have to be on the agenda and in a couple of years we can try to advance," he says.

Mr Jank and many others in Brazil believe consolidation of the global market is inevitable. In that process, the US will be the most significant single interest. In that context, each side has every reason to reach out to the other.

U.S., Brazil Weigh Ethanol Pact (WSJ)

By Antonio Regalado

Wall Street Journal, March 7, 2007

SÃO PAULO, Brazil -- President Bush is scheduled to arrive in Brazil tomorrow to discuss a possible alliance on ethanol fuel, but investors aren't waiting for a pact: They are already pouring money into new ethanol mills and sugar-cane fields here to meet growing domestic demand for the biofuel and in the hopes that exports will boom, too.

The U.S. market remains largely off-limits to Brazil because of tariffs and quotas that protect the U.S. ethanol industry, which is based on corn rather than sugar. But Japan and other energy-poor nations in Europe are already looking to Latin America's largest country for ethanol.

A spate of deals is bringing new names and big money to what has traditionally been a family-run industry in Brazil, sparking a wave of acquisitions and new projects. For instance, a company controlled by George Soros and U.S. hedge fund HBK Investments recently acquired a sugar-cane mill and is planning to invest more than $700 million on new capacity to produce ethanol.

Other actors include agricultural-trading firms such as Cargill Inc., which acquired a mill last summer. And Brazil's state-owned oil titan Petroleo Brasileiro, or Petrobras, is negotiating with Japan's Mitsui & Co. to buy and construct mills as part of a long-term agreement to supply Japan with ethanol. Japan's government is planning to require a mix of as much as 10% ethanol in gasoline.

As the price of oil has risen in recent years, along with fears about how fast existing oil supplies can grow, ethanol has gained more attention as a potentially cheaper option, and as a renewable fuel that won't ever run out. President Bush wants to sharply increase U.S. production. Ethanol can be added to gasoline to help extend supplies, or used in so-called flex-fuel cars that run on either fuel.

While the U.S. produces slightly more ethanol than Brazil, the South American nation is seen as the world's leader. Sugar-cane ethanol, which is basically fermented sugar that gets distilled into alcohol, is cheaper than ethanol made from corn, and Brazilian government policies mean ethanol now makes up more than 40% of fuel used in automobiles here.

Brazil is proof that "the economics of a renewable fuel is very competitive," said Neil Koehler, chief executive officer of Pacific Ethanol, a U.S.-based corn-ethanol producer. Pacific is focused on supplying the U.S. market, but because Brazilian ethanol is less expensive, Mr. Koehler says it is likely the country will be first to conquer new markets such as Japan, which don't make their own ethanol and don't have import tariffs.

DOJ_NMG_0141585

After weathering an ethanol crisis in the late 1990s, Brazil's market started to heat up with the introduction of flex-fuel cars in 2003. Last month, more than 80% of new cars sold in Brazil were flex-fuel models, and companies including General Motors Corp. have stopped building gas-only autos here.

Interest in the export market began to grow rapidly last year, as Mr. Bush began putting political weight behind ethanol. "There are a huge number of investors, funds, traders, oil companies, commodities companies, all considering entering the market," said José Luiz Olivério, senior technology and development vice president at Dedini SA, a major Brazilian supplier of crushers and distillers used in making ethanol from sugar cane.

Officials from both countries say the contemplated U.S.-Brazil deal on biofuel is likely to include the creation of a body to set technical standards and support for sugar-cane production elsewhere in Latin America. Such steps are needed to create a robust international market for ethanol, which isn't yet traded easily like soy or other commodities.

The emergence of a global trade in ethanol is changing a Brazilian industry dominated by family-run operations focused on sugar, not on ethanol. Alfred Szwarc, an executive with Unica, the São Paulo state sugar-cane association, says momentum is building for companies that can acquire and professionalize such operations.

According to Dedini, Brazil has 357 sugar mills in operation, 43 under construction and a further 244 in the planning stages. While the majority of actual investments are from established families, foreign investors are involved in about 20% to 35% of the newer projects.

While the fragmented market is an opening for investors, making acquisitions has proved challenging. Many family-owned operations don't have audited financials, others have unpaid taxes or worker liabilities stretching back years. "The history of sugar cane is good and bad families," said Marcelo Vieira, sugar-cane and coffee manager of Adecoagro, an operating company of International Farmland Holding LLC, a Delaware agricultural holding company that is backed by Mr. Soros and his family. That means some investors have left Brazil empty-handed.

Other companies are now looking to build new plantations from scratch outside traditional sugar-cane areas near São Paulo, says Mr. Vieira, who joined Adecoagro after the company purchased his family's mill in the state of Minas Gerais. For its next project, Adecoagro is spending $150 million on a new mill in Mato Grosso do Sul state, with plans for further expansions.

Other groups are also launching ambitious efforts, aimed primarily at the export market. Samir Kaul, a partner with Khosla Ventures, says the U.S. venture-capital firm is involved in a pending deal to produce ethanol in Brazil. Already a leading investor in renewables in the U.S., Mr. Kaul says Brazil is "the most experienced in doing it, and they are the cheapest right now."

Land is not expected to be a limitation. Brazil has hundreds of millions of acres for grazing cattle that could be converted to sugar-cane production.

For such investors, the U.S. market remains a major draw, despite a tariff of more than 50 cents a gallon on imported ethanol. If Mr. Bush's call for the U.S. to use 35 billion gallons of renewable fuels by 2017 plays out, corn ethanol is expected to supply only half of that. Investors believe that imports will fill a significant niche, and the only country positioned to be a major exporter is Brazil.

Losing Latin America (WT)

By Kay Bailey Hutchison

The Washington Times, March 7, 2007

When President Bush leaves tomorrow on a five-nation tour of Latin America, he will be entering a region that has become more important to our national security than at any point since the Cold War.

Not too long ago, Latin America was a vital front in the fight against communism, and if recent events are any guide, it could become equally important in the war on terror.

A fresh wave of authoritarianism -- fueled by petrodollars, populism and anti-Americanism -- has cast a dark cloud over the future of freedom in our hemisphere. In order to deal with this emerging threat, we need to dust off the Cold War playbook and become increasingly active in helping our friends to the south.

The problem starts (but doesn't end) in Venezuela, a nation that once enjoyed a 50-year democratic tradition, but is now in the early stages of a dictatorship. Venezuela's messianic president, Hugo Chavez, has basically become a power unto himself. Last month, elected representatives abdicated their responsibility and gave the Venezuelan leader the sweeping power to rule by decree for 18 months so he can impose sweeping economic, social and political change.

These dictatorial powers would be alarming in anyone's hands, but they're particularly dangerous in the hands of Mr. Chavez. The strongman rules an oil-rich nation that exports 1.1 million barrels of oil to the United States per day, which amounts to 14 percent of our total oil imports. Mr. Chavez has already colluded with other OPEC nations to raise oil prices, and if he's successful in nationalizing multibillion-dollar crude projects in the Orinoco Belt, there's a risk that prices could jump again.

DOJ_NMG_0141586

This could have a severe impact on the pocketbooks of American families and small businesses. According to some economists, every time oil prices rise by 10 percent, on average 150,000 Americans lose their jobs. Mr. Chavez has used his nation's windfall oil profits to buy political support at home and stir trouble abroad. He has said that Venezuela has a "strong oil card to play on the geopolitical stage" and "it is a card that we are going to play with toughness against the toughest country in the world, the United States."

In his struggle against U.S. "imperialism," Mr. Chavez has found a useful ally in the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism -- the government of Iran. He is one of the few leaders to publicly support Iran's nuclear weapons program, and the Iranian mullahs have rewarded Mr. Chavez's friendship with lucrative contracts, including the transfer of Iranian professionals and technologies to Venezuela. Last month, Mr. Chavez and Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad revealed plans for a $2 billion joint fund, part of which will be used as a "mechanism for liberation" against American allies. This could help achieve Mr. Chavez's vision, shared in an earlier meeting with Mr. Ahmadinejad, when he said, "Let's save the human race; let's finish off the U.S. empire."

Mr. Chavez has grown bolder by interfering in the elections of several Latin American countries, and his brand of revolutionary politics has made gains in some of them. Bolivia's newly elected president, Evo Morales, has nationalized the energy industry, rewritten the constitution and promised to work with Mr. Chavez and Cuban dictator Fidel Castro to form an "Axis of Good" to oppose the United States.

Perhaps most ominously, the former Soviet client Daniel Ortega has returned to the presidency of Nicaragua. During the 1980s, Mr. Ortega ruled his country with an iron fist until U.S.-backed freedom fighters ousted him from power. Nicaragua's democracy prospered for the next 16 years, but now he is back. In response to the Ortega victory, Mr. Chavez chanted "long live the Sandinista revolution!" Then, in his first week as president, Mr. Ortega met with Iran's Mr. Ahmadinejad, and told the press that Nicaragua and Iran "share common interests and [have common] enemies."

Left unchecked, Messrs. Ahmadinejad and Chavez could be the Khrushchev-Castro tandem of the early 21st century, funneling arms, money and propaganda to Latin America, and endangering that region's fragile democracies and volatile economies. If these two pariahs succeed, the next terrorist training camp could shift from the Middle East to America's doorstep.

We need to face reality and confront this threat head-on. At the pinnacle of the Cold War, Ronald Reagan seized the initiative and repulsed Soviet efforts to set up camp in our hemisphere. The Gipper's leadership should serve as a model in thwarting the advance of tyranny and terrorism in our times.

We should build new bridges to our friends in the region -- pressing forward on free trade, development aid, military cooperation and exchange programs. Let's take the necessary steps today, so tomorrow we won't have to ask: "Who lost Latin America?"

Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchison of Texas is chairman of the Senate Republican Policy Committee.

Latin America's Turn (WP)

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

PRESIDENT BUSH'S tour of Latin America beginning tomorrow will be shadowed by Hugo Chávez, in more ways than one. On Friday, when Mr. Bush is to visit Uruguay, the Venezuelan president will appear at a mass rally across the Plate River in Argentina, where he will try to drown out his American rival. Mr. Chávez has paid well for his Buenos Aires soapbox: He has used Venezuela's petrodollars to buy $1.5 billion in Argentine debt, allowing leftist president Néstor Kirchner to steer clear of the International Monetary Fund.

Mr. Bush seems to understand that to confront Mr. Chávez, in words or otherwise, would be to provide him with the U.S. enemy he craves. When it goes unanswered, the Venezuelan's rhetoric tends to boomerang: Polls show that Mr. Chávez's popularity rating in Latin America is just as low as Mr. Bush's. Mr. Bush's duty is to demonstrate that those who choose alliance with the United States and the democratic world benefit more than Venezuela's motley collection of allies, headed by Cuba and Iran.

The president took a step in that direction on Monday by delivering a speech in which he announced several new aid initiatives on top of the $1.7 billion already budgeted for the region. A military hospital ship will tour the Caribbean, countering the Cuban doctors who shuttle around the region at Venezuela's expense. More scholarships will be offered to needy students to study in the United States, and housing assistance programs will be beefed up. Those are positive but modest steps. What's also needed are major U.S. initiatives to strengthen relations with the largest and most important Latin American countries: Brazil, Mexico and Colombia.

Mr. Bush still isn't doing enough to deliver what those countries most want from Washington. Brazil, for instance, would like a lowering of U.S. trade barriers. Yet while Mr. Bush will join with President Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva in unveiling an interesting joint initiative to develop biofuels, what he won't do is support the removal of the senseless tariff now imposed on U.S. imports of

DOJ_NMG_0141587

Brazil's sugar cane-based ethanol. The administration is negotiating with Democrats in Congress on passage of important free-trade agreements with Colombia, Peru and Panama, but more presidential involvement is needed to push the treaties through. Similarly, good relations with Mexico hinge on rational and humane U.S. immigration reform; the White House has endorsed the right elements but never worked for their enactment.

Mr. Bush will never win a war of rhetoric with Mr. Chávez. But the United States ought to be able to offer far more than Venezuela can to Latin Americans hoping for social and economic improvement. Six years after Mr. Bush promised to make the region a priority of his presidency, it's not too late to deliver.

Thanks To Mr. Chávez (NYT)

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

Venezuela and its demagogic president, Hugo Chávez, won't get a visit from President Bush. But Mr. Chávez's appeal will be very much on Mr. Bush's mind when he visits Latin America over the next week.

That's actually a healthy development.

If your taste runs to three-hour speeches, chiseling away at democracy and a world-class personality cult, Mr. Chávez is your man. But if the goal is to lift millions of people out of grinding poverty, only a major effort by the United States — the hemisphere's biggest economy and strongest democracy — can make a serious difference. And if it takes Mr. Chávez's demagogy to spur Washington toward more enlightened policies in the Americas, so be it.

Concern over the popularity of Fidel Castro inspired the pro-democracy, pro-development policies of the Alliance for Progress during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, one of the happier periods of inter-American relations.

In recent years, Washington has looked at Latin America with tunnel vision. It has selectively concerned itself with issues that have important political constituencies in the United States, like drug trafficking, immigration, military cooperation and trade and investment liberalization. And it has shortchanged many of the issues that matter most to Latin Americans, like development, poverty reduction, access to credit, education and health care.

Mr. Bush should use this trip, which will take him to Brazil, Uruguay, Guatemala, Colombia and Mexico, to start a new version of the alliance, one intended to reinforce democracy across the region. He should commit himself to ensuring that the benefits of expanded trade and investment reach the millions of Latin America's urban and rural poor, not just the usual narrow elites.

He needs to challenge the uneven human rights performance of allies like Colombia and Guatemala. Washington's double standard on human rights undercuts its credibility when pointing to Mr. Chávez's intimidation and prosecution of critics.

The White House is promoting this tour as part of a new push to promote social justice in the hemisphere, and it cites a raft of what it calls new administration initiatives to that end. But a close examination reveals that many of these consist of little more than a repackaging of existing programs, including H.I.V./AIDS spending, debt relief, the Millennium Challenge program and trade agreements.

Still, the list includes some new and potentially useful ideas, like additional help for financing affordable mortgages, small business loans and health care training. These need to be significantly expanded. Mr. Bush deserves praise for doubling the assistance to Latin America, to $1.6 billion a year. But much of this has been for security programs in Colombia. A lot more will be needed if promoting social justice is to be more than a sound bite.

When Mr. Bush first ran for president seven years ago, he said that as governor of Texas, he had a special understanding of, and empathy for, Latin America. With Washington's reputation in the hemisphere nearing its modern nadir, there could hardly be a better time to put that understanding and empathy to work.

An Answer For Hugo ChÃ¡vez (WP)

By Jorge G. Castaã±eda

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

MEXICO CITY -- Each stop on President Bush's upcoming swing through Latin America has its own mini-agenda: ethanol and the Doha round with Brazil; a Trade Framework Agreement in Uruguay; Plan Colombia and drug enforcement in BogotÃ¡; immigration and security with Mexico and Guatemala. But there is an overall agenda for which this trip may well represent too little, too late: ChÃ¡vez containment.

The balance of forces in the region has shifted. Not only has the leftward tilt persisted -- with electoral victories in Nicaragua and Ecuador, unprecedented near-misses in Mexico and Peru, unexpected advances in Colombia -- but the Venezuelan president's influence has expanded. Hugo ChÃ¡vez has found his sea legs and assembled an impressive array of tools to seduce the region. His "21st-century socialism" is a strange blend of a state-run economy, blanket social subsidies, a

DOJ_NMG_0141588

perpetual presidency, government by decree, and authoritarian theory and practices, as well as endless quarrels with Washington.

Thanks to unlimited oil revenue (for now) and an endless stream of Cuban doctors, educators and security personnel -- and soon, bountiful supplies of Russian arms made in Venezuela -- the new Caribbean caudillo is on a roll. ChÃ¡vez has skillfully exploited the disappointment of the region's poor with the economic reforms of the past two decades; he is (for now) delivering the goods: bare-bones health care, literacy campaigns, price controls on food staples. ChÃ¡vez has extended his reach to Bolivia, where Evo Morales worships him; to Argentina, where he and his populist colleague NÃ©stor Kirchner are preparing a massive anti-Bush rally to coincide with the American president's arrival across the bay in Montevideo; and increasingly to Ecuador and Nicaragua, through generous handouts. Guatemala and Paraguay could be next.

While much of ChÃ¡vez's socialism is either rhetorical or rooted in economic policy, it entails serious backsliding on human rights and representative democracy. Ultimately, if ChÃ¡vez wants to wreck Venezuela's economy, that is the Venezuelan people's business; but if he seeks to extend his concentration of power in Venezuela or elsewhere, that is everybody's business. It is time for others to say so and to undertake the necessary ideological and political struggle to check ChÃ¡vez and Havana, both rebutting their populist fallacies and failures and vaunting the merits of the democratic alternative, a globalized market economy, imperfect as it may be.

George W. Bush is the least appropriate person on Earth for this mission; he is immensely unpopular in Latin America -- not since Richard Nixon's trip to Caracas in 1959 have so many protests been likely -- and since Sept. 11, 2001, he has neglected the hemisphere. Many snicker that if he defends democracy in Latin America as well as he has in Iraq, only God can help Latin American democrats.

The good news is that there is someone who can do the job, if he receives political cover and international financial support for the task. Mexico's Felipe CalderÃ³n is ideally suited to engage ChÃ¡vez and the Castro brothers in the inevitable ideological fisticuffs. He believes in human rights and democracy, and he understands macroeconomic policy and the need for effective anti-poverty programs. He also knows he has to get along with his northern neighbor.

CalderÃ³n, young and a forceful debater, is a better option than Alvaro Uribe of Colombia, which shares a border with Venezuela. Brazil's left wing would not allow Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva to take on ChÃ¡vez, even if Lula wanted to. Chile is a splendid example of the success of sensible, socially minded policies, but President Michele Bachelet has proved unwilling to sing their praises. And while Oscar Arias of Costa Rica has the personal prestige and experience, his country does not.

Yet, even CalderÃ³n has a problem. His predecessors' public debates with Castro, ChÃ¡vez and Kirchner played well with some Mexicans but went down terribly with the country's traditional establishment: the pro-Cuban PRD and the nationalist PRI old guard. Declared an illegitimate leader by his rival for the presidency and elected with only 35 percent of the vote, CalderÃ³n is understandably reluctant to brave the chattering classes without some guarantee that Bush will not leave him hanging on immigration, as he did Vicente Fox. Some believe that CalderÃ³n is thinking of throwing in the towel on the ideological debate and mending fences with Caracas, Havana and Buenos Aires, democracy and human rights violations notwithstanding.

But if Bush finally brings with him to Mexico a firm commitment to comprehensive immigration reform, and the bipartisan backing of House and Senate leaders to approve it promptly, CalderÃ³n would enjoy the necessary leeway to wage the battle of ideas with the region's populist tide. That would be the best way to contain it: with the ideas of Mexico and its friends, not with Washington's attempts at force.

The writer was Mexico's foreign minister from 2000 to 2003, under President Vicente Fox, and is now a professor of politics and Latin American and Caribbean studies at New York University.

Venezuela Disavows 1980s-Era Bonds (NYT)

By Jens Erik Gould

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

CARACAS, Venezuela, March 6 — The plot would seem to come right out of a novel in which the reader does not know whom to believe.

A group of investors from Columbus, Ohio, spends $100 million in 2004 to buy zero-coupon bonds — debt that pays interest at maturity — from a Venezuelan state bank that went bankrupt in the 1980s. A few months earlier, in October 2003, Venezuela's solicitor general ruled that the bonds were valid. But when the investor group tried to redeem the debt, it could not, and learned only later that the solicitor general had reversed herself in December 2003.

That is the basic story line in an international financial dispute that is playing out in Federal District Court for Southern Ohio. The investor group, Skye Ventures, is suing Venezuela for its refusal to honor the bonds, which it says are now worth as much as $1 billion.

DOJ_NMG_0141589

The dispute over the bonds, which bear the name of an extinct state agricultural development bank, the Banco de Desarrollo Agropecuario, or Bandagro, has not recently been discussed in public by the government of Venezuela, where President Hugo Chávez rarely lets any issue involving the United States pass.

But it could well become a cautionary tale, whether for investors in emerging markets or for Venezuela — which, Skye says, may be liable for up to $6 billion if all the bondholders press their claims.

There are signs that Venezuela has taken the case seriously. Its chief lawyer in the case, Esther Bigott de Loaiza, has close ties to top government officials. But she was ousted late last year after she was named in a lawsuit, now dismissed, that said Venezuela had paid her $18 million in the case. Ms. Bigott de Loaiza declined several requests for an interview, saying only that she had left the case "in the ninth inning, with Venezuela winning 9 to 0."

Last week, Venezuela fired its American lawyers, the Florida-based firm of Ruden McClosky. Armando E. Lacasa, a lawyer in the Miami office who was assigned to the case, said this week that Venezuela had not given him an explanation for its action. He did say Venezuela had not yet paid Ruden for the two years of work it did on the case.

Waldemar Cordero Vale, who was president of the bank when the bonds were supposed to have been issued in 1981, said in an interview that he never signed them. He asserts that a Panamanian investment group that sold the paper to Skye participated in a scheme with Venezuelan officials to share the payment. "It's the biggest fraud in the history of Venezuela," said Mr. Cordero Vale, who now takes care of a farm on the Venezuelan plains.

Lawyers at Ruden McClosky had also raised questions about the Panamanian group, which they say was managed by James Pavanelli and had unsuccessfully sought payment on the bonds since the late 1980s. They pointed to documents bearing the letterheads of Interpol and various Italian courts that said Mr. Pavanelli was suspected of trying to transport fake Bandagro bonds in 1988 and was convicted of fraud in connection with the bonds in Italy in 2003.

An Interpol spokesman declined to comment. The F.B.I. said it had no information about Mr. Pavanelli.

Skye disputes the Venezuelan assertions. Its president, David Richards, said, "If you consider the idea that their theory is that a U.S. firm with prominent investors has a method of creating investments by bribing foreign officials and buying their bonds, then suing in U.S. courts, well it is fairly preposterous, isn't it?"

Skye contends that when Bandagro went bankrupt in 1981, Venezuela assured investors that it would assume and pay the bank's debts.

The Federal District Court ruled last year that Skye's ability to sue Venezuela in the United States would hinge more on whether the first opinion by the solicitor general, Marisol Plaza, was valid than on the authenticity of the notes. The ruling gave Skye an advantage in the case because it turned attention away from evidence suggesting that the bonds were fake. Depositions in the case had been set for later this month, though Mr. Lacasa of Ruden said Venezuela had asked the court for a 90-day delay so it would have time to hire new lawyers.

The Finance Ministry did not respond to interview requests. Ms. Plaza told a local newspaper, El Nacional, that her first opinion was merely an internal document never meant to be made public and that bondholders had stolen a copy.

Mr. Richards, who would not disclose the names of his partners, said his investor group included a billionaire principal of a private equity firm and a Fortune 500 executive. He said he expected that the verdict would reinforce the power of the American courts to protect American investors. And he warned that Skye could go after Venezuelan assets in the United States, like the Citgo oil company, if Venezuela lost and still refused to pay. Legal experts said, though, that taking aim at state-owned companies could present obstacles for creditors.

Skye paints the case as a litmus test for the Chávez government's willingness to pay its obligations, arguing that a refusal may damage its creditworthiness in international markets.

"If he doesn't pay these bonds that I bought on the basis of a decision of his highest legal officer," Mr. Richards said, "what's to say he doesn't have to pay every bond?"

But the group's investment in Venezuela is far from representative of most investor activity in Venezuelan debt.

In fact, credit-rating agencies have a stable outlook for Venezuela's debt, mainly because the Chávez government has benefited from high oil prices and has foreign reserves and other funds totaling some $50 billion. That has helped the government maintain a solid record of making payments.

"On a numbers basis, Venezuela is doing much better than its peers," said Richard Francis, a credit analyst at Standard & Poor's.

Still, Mr. Chávez has generated concern in much of private industry here since January, when he announced the nationalization of the electricity and telecommunications industries, whose flagship companies were partly owned by American businesses. The president is tightening state control over the economy and says he is driving Venezuela toward socialism.

"These nationalizations affect the private sector working in Venezuela, but the government's capacity to pay is still the same," said Hilario Ramírez, associate director for Fitch Ratings in Venezuela.

Legal experts say the Bandagro case is unusual because the underlying validity of the bonds is in question, while most cases seek to enforce bonds whose legality is not being contested.

The case could increase the due diligence burden on investors if there is persuasive evidence that the notes are authentic, and Venezuela wins anyway, said Anna Gelpern, an associate professor of law at Rutgers University, Newark, and an expert on emerging markets debt. The verdict will not have much effect on investors, she said, if the paper is proved to be false.

Whether a government legal officer's "opinion is sufficient to turn a fake into a real bond is a serious question mark," Ms. Gelpern said.

Brokerage firms, former lawmakers and local economists interviewed for this article — many of them sharply critical of the government — agree that the bonds are indeed fake and that Venezuela should not pay.

A 2003 National Assembly investigation of the case supplied by Francisco Rodríguez, a lawmaker at the time who is now on the faculty of economics at Wesleyan University in Connecticut, found no record of the debt issue in any government institution.

And before Skye bought the bonds, previous finance ministers issued statements warning of the circulation of fraudulent Bandagro debt. Mr. Cordero Vale said Skye never contacted him about the bonds' authenticity before buying them.

Skye responds that it conducted five months of exhaustive due diligence before purchasing the bonds. It says it learned at that point of the solicitor general's first finding but was never told of her reversal.

Skye has hired a Los Angeles public relations firm specializing in crisis management, Sitrick & Company, whose clients include Rush Limbaugh and Halle Berry, in an effort to galvanize favorable public opinion.

Robert R. Bottome, editor of a Caracas economic magazine, Veneconomía, who has followed the Bandagro bond case since the notes appeared in the 1980s, is among the critics here who accuse Venezuela's legal team of mishandling the case. "They couldn't have handled it worse if they had really wanted to lose the case," he said.

Analysts like Mr. Ramírez of Fitch contend that the Venezuelan government wants to prevent the case from affecting its standing in the international markets, and would therefore be likely to settle if it stands to lose the case and any subsequent appeals. Others, like Miguel Octavio of BBO Servicios Financieros, a Caracas brokerage firm, say that Venezuela's willingness to honor its foreign obligations ultimately depends on whether oil prices remain high enough to keep government coffers full.

"Chávez has paid off debt because he can," Mr. Octavio said. "The day he needs money, we'll see if he changes his mind."

Iran Offers To Negotiate With U.N. (AP)

By George Jahn

AP, March 7, 2007

Iran demanded an end to Security Council "interference" in an offer made public Tuesday in exchange for clearing up suspicions about its disputed nuclear activities — an apparent attempt to head off new U.N sanctions over its refusal to stop uranium enrichment.

The overture, contained in a document made available to The Associated Press, came as the five permanent council members deliberated a new resolution aiming to tighten up sanctions against Iran for its nuclear defiance.

Iran has made similar offers before, but renewing it now seemed to be linked to those moves in New York, even though diplomats involved in working on a new draft resolution cautioned any agreement was some time off.

Such deliberations usually pit Russia and China — which seek more lenience — against the United States, Britain and France. The initial set of sanctions agreed upon Dec. 23 were milder than the West had wanted and took Russian and Chinese reservations into account.

The document said Iran was ready to "negotiate ... for the resolution of outstanding issues with the IAEA ... without the interference of the United Nation(s) Security Council."

Signed by Ali Ashgar Soltanieh, Iran's chief representative to the agency, the letter also said the country was ready to "enter a constructive ... negotiation."

The document was dated Feb. 19 but Soltanieh, in a cover letter dated March 2, asked it to be presented in full to the 35 board members of the IAEA, and diplomats from board member nations said it was being circulated Tuesday at a meeting of the IAEA's 35-nation board.

The offer to negotiate has repeatedly been rejected by the five Security Council permanent members and Germany — Iran's key interlocutors on its nuclear program — because the Islamic republic refuses their precondition that it first halt enrichment. Iranian opposition to freezing first and talking later has doomed previous talks.

Soltanieh told The Associated Press that "no country welcomes sanctions" because they mean "more problems for the people and the country," but added: "This does not mean we will be afraid."

DOJ_NMG_0141591

His comments were unsually subdued compared to the usual defiance of Iran's hardline president, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad.

Enrichment is key because it can be used to make the fissile core of nuclear warheads, although Iran insists it wants to enrich only to low levels used to generate power. The U.S. and its allies fear that Iran could build nuclear weapons with larger amounts of more highly enriched uranium.

Mohamed ElBaradei, chief of the IAEA, also has made an issue of Iran's spotty record of cooperation with his inspectors.

ElBaradei, whose agency has spent more than four years probing Iran's nuclear activities, told a 35-nation IAEA board meeting on its opening day Monday that IAEA is "unable to provide the required assurance about the peaceful nature of Iran's nuclear program."

ElBaradei on Monday said that Iran appeared to have at least temporarily paused in expanding its uranium-enrichment program, a possible indication that the country hopes to blunt fresh Security Council action.

But underlining that any pause was informal and temporary, ElBaradei, in separate comments, repeated the main finding of his recent report on Iran, saying that "Iran has not suspended its enrichment-related activities" as demanded by the Security Council. That report was up for review Wednesday by the board.

And on Tuesday Iranian Foreign Minister Manouchehr Mottaki said Iran's "legitimate activities with the aim of producing fuel is continuing."

The board was expected to approve last month's decision by ElBaradei to partially or fully suspend nearly half the technical aid his agency provides to Iran — 23 projects in all. Only North Korea and Saddam Hussein's Iraq have faced such punishment in the past.

The board will also be reviewing North Korea's apparent willingness to ultimately dismantle its nuclear arms-making capabilities and a planned visit to Pyongyang by ElBaradei after the end of the Vienna meeting.

Funds Told To Cut Ties To Iran (USAT)

By Barbara Slavin

USA Today, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON — Federal lawmakers and officials in at least four states are pushing government-employee pension funds to dump shares of foreign companies that do business in Iran.

On Tuesday, Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, R-Fla., proposed legislation that would require federal pension funds to unload shares of any company with more than $20 million invested in Iran's energy sector.

Government and private pension funds operating in the USA would be barred from future purchases of shares of companies investing in Iran, under Ros-Lehtinen's bill.

In June, Missouri ordered state-employee pension funds to sell shares of companies with commercial interests in Iran, North Korea, Syria and Sudan. All four countries are accused by the State Department of sponsoring terrorism.

Georgia, California and Florida are considering similar measures.

U.S. companies are already prohibited from most trade with and investment in Iran.

The proposed restrictions would ban government pension funds from owning shares of foreign companies that are working to overhaul Iran's oil infrastructure and develop its natural gas assets. Most are energy and engineering companies based in Europe and Asia.

Among the targets: Anglo-Dutch giant Shell, France's Total, Italy's ENI, Russia's Gazprom, Germany's Siemens and China's Sinopec and China National Petroleum (CNPC).

By denying Iran foreign capital, "we hamper the deadly ambitions of a regime heavily dependent on income earned from oil and natural gas," Ros-Lehtinen said in a statement.

The United Nations Security Council imposed trade sanctions on Iran in December after it refused to suspend efforts to make nuclear fuel. The United States and other members are mulling stiffer sanctions in response to a report by the U.N. nuclear watchdog, which says Iran is accelerating its program.

The U.S. Treasury has pressured European banks to halt or restrict transactions with Iranian banks. It says the Iranian banks move money for Iran's nuclear program and help fund Islamic terror groups.

The pension moves come as inflation and unemployment are rising in Iran. Ali Khamenei, Iran's supreme leader, has accused President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad of mishandling the economy.

"Can this be costly to Iran? Absolutely," says Trita Parsi, president of the National Iranian American Council in Washington. "Can it be enough to cause a change in policy? That I'm doubtful of."

Hu Yi, senior economist at CNPC, said U.S. pension fund restrictions would not affect CNPC.

DOJ_NMG_0141592

Shell spokesman Adam Newton said Shell's decision on a $10 billion gas deal in Iran "is a year or so away, so it would be premature to speculate" about the impact.

In April, Nationwide Financial will add a "terror-free" mutual fund to options for 25,000 401(k) plans it administers. The Roosevelt Anti-Terror Multi-Cap Fund will screen out companies with ties to Iran and others on the U.S. terrorism list.

Pro-Israel groups are considering formal Iran-divestment campaigns: the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, a pro-Israel lobbying group, and the Jewish Council for Public Affairs, which represents national and local Jewish groups.

2nd UPDATE: US House Panel: To Strengthen Iran Sanctions Act (DJ)

By Ian Talley

Dow Jones, March 7, 2007

(Updates with background and comments throughout)

WASHINGTON (Dow Jones)--The chairman of the U.S. House Foreign Affairs Committee said Tuesday he was introducing legislation that would strengthen the Iran Sanctions Act and would require the Bush administration to sanction any companies with deals worth more than $20 million with Iran.

If passed, the bill could mean sanctions on several oil companies planning major billion-dollar projects in Iran if they moved ahead with their projects.

The Bush administration has used its authority to waive implementation of the sanctions act for 20 years, but new legislation would prevent the administration from "abusing its waiver authority," Tom Lantos, D-Calif., said. While the U.S. has imposed various sanctions against U.S. companies doing business with Iran since the 1979 Iranian revolution, the 1996 Iran-Libya Sanctions Act was the first to attempt to penalize foreign companies.

Critics say the U.S. hasn't adequately enforced the law or closed loopholes used by companies to maintain business relationships with Iran.

The law was renamed the Iran Sanctions Act after the U.S. restored diplomatic relations with Libya.

The U.S. is using various tactics to pressure Iran into halting its alleged nuclear weapons program. As the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries second-largest producer, almost 60% of the state's revenues are derived from oil and undermining development of its energy sector is seen as one way of putting pressure on the regime to stop its nuclear weapons program.

If passed, Lantos' legislation would sanction companies - such as Royal Dutch Shell (RDSA), Repsol (REP), Statoil (STO), Norsk Hydro ASA (NHY), Australia LNG, and China's National Offshore Oil Corp. (CEO) - that are preparing to sign several major oil and gas deals.

Shell and Spain's Repsol signed in January a preliminary $10 billion agreement with the Iranian government to develop two phases of the huge South Pars gas field. Many other companies are mulling Iran's offers of onshore and offshore blocks for development of hydrocarbons.

"Those halcyon days for the oil industry are over," Lantos said in his opening statement in a hearing entitled "The Iranian Challenge." Lantos accused the State Department of "systematically undermining our desire to use economic sanctions."

In response to lawmakers' criticism, U.S. Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs Nicholas Burns said the Bush administration was in talks with oil company chief executives and heads of states who were considering signing project deals with Iran. The White House is trying keep these projects from progressing, Burns said.

Burns said he has told CEOs and prime ministers that the U.S. was "vigorously opposed" to the deals and that any agreements would "undermine international efforts to resolve the nuclear issue."

"Our discussions are intended to diminish the likelihood of seeing them finalized," Burns said in his submitted testimony.

"We don't think countries should exercise a business-as-usual practice with Iran...and we'll continue to use our diplomatic influence to convince them not to go forward," Burns said.

Supporting Lantos' call, ranking member Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, R-Fla., said: "It is imperative that we implement all sanctions already available to us under current U.S. law."

Ros-Lehtinen later told Dow Jones Newswires that although she did want the administration to use its powers to sanction violators, she wouldn't sign up to the law if it included requiring the administration to negotiate with the Iranian regime.

Ros-Lehtinen, cosponsored by Lantos, also introduced the Iran Divestiture Legislation that would require U.S. government pension funds, including the Thrift Savings Plan with more than $210 billion in assets, to divest in companies doing business with Iran. The bill would prohibit future investments in Iran by pension plans and mutual funds doing business in Iran.

Burns said the administration wasn't in favor of using the Iran Sanctions act because it might erode the international consensus developing at the Security Council and because it would create difficult trade relationships with allies. Russia and

DOJ_NMG_0141593

China - both of which have national companies examining multi-billion dollar oil and gas projects in Iran - are two key votes that are needed in the council for tougher U.N. sanctions against Iran.

"All of our allies are trading with Iran," Burns said, "What we are trying to do is to convince them that they need to act in their national interest to stop that business-as-usual approach."

Leveraging the Iran Sanctions Act against companies operating in Iran such as China's CNOOC, "may not be the best way to maintain this very broad international coalition that we have built up," he said.

The Bush administration instead has been focusing its economic-sanction efforts against the financial sector.

The U.S. Treasury recently created the terrorism financial intelligence team, which has been able to persuade major banks such as Credit Suisse (CS) and HSBC (HBC) to stop their financial interactions with Iranian banks because of the reputational risk involved. Furthermore, the Treasury has prohibited U.S. dollar interactions with two Iranian banks it linked to terrorism and supporting the regime attempting to build a nuclear bomb.

Asked why Iran's other banks weren't also penalized, Burns said the administration would "press forward" with those types of sanctions, "and I'd be very surprised if we didn't see us move forward with similar actions in the future."

Burns said he believed the U.N. and banking sanctions were working against Iran, though a second set of Security Council sanctions was needed and likely to be agreed. "Iran is now off-balanced, more isolated and under more international scrutiny," Burns said.

In February, the Foreign Affairs Committee passed an amendment to the Iran Sanctions Act that would include petrochemical and liquefied natural gas companies, and cover subsidiaries of U.S. companies.

German Group Seeks Iran Gas Contract (FT)

By Carola Hoyos, Daniel Dombey And Ivar Simensen

Financial Times, March 7, 2007

Eon, Germany's biggest importer of natural gas, is pursuing its first gas supply contract with Iran in an effort to reduce its dependence on Russia.

The company on Tuesday confirmed it was in talks with liquefied natural gas producers over a supply contract. "One of the producer countries is, of course, Iran. The country has the world's second largest natural gas reserves," said a company official.

Both Germany and the UK are at the centre of international efforts to persuade Iran to curb its nuclear programme and are seeking to frame a new United Nations resolution that would add to limited sanctions on Tehran, by tightening restrictions on the financing of Iran's nuclear and missile programmes and introducing a travel ban.

Centrica, the UK's biggest residential energy supplier, also has said it was looking at Iran as a potential source of gas supplies. The decline in North Sea gas production has been a big impetus for it to broaden its search.

"No one is discussing full-blown trade and economic sanctions at this stage," said a British official.

"All we can do is to suggest to companies that when they are looking at the Iranian market that they want to bear in mind that Iran is essentially in the international dock," the official said. "Is it a good investment prospect at this particular point in time?"

The fact that companies are looking to do long-term LNG deals with Iran despite the hostile political climate indicates just how difficult it has become to secure gas supplies, particularly for delivery dates from 2010-2011, by which time Eon hopes its Wilhelmshaven LNG facility will be ready.

Frank Harris, of Wood Mackenzie, the energy consultants, said: "Lots of people are desperate to buy volumes," adding that Algeria and Nigeria were attracting a lot of interest as Russia's supplies were being called into question and projects, including those in gas-rich Qatar, were being delayed because of the capacity crunch in contractors.

He said Iran was a risky place to do business, not only because of international politics. Three Indian buyers found their 2005 LNG deal for 5m tonnes a year disintegrated as the gas price rose. "The real issue is: If you do a deal with Iran, will they deliver on time?" he said.

Iran has four LNG projects on the books, which have yet to receive investment approval. The completion dates are still uncertain because of fears of an international embargo, war and the lack of US technology available due to sanctions.

In spite of the odds, Iran has attracted AngloDutch Royal Dutch Shell and Spain's Repsol as potential foreign partners in its Persian LNG project, and Total of France and Malaysia's Petronas for its Pars LNG project. For those two projects and the two others for which Iran has yet to attract foreign partners to go ahead, the country will need to secure several 15–20-year supply agreements.

Iran: Retired Defense Minister Missing (AP)

By Ali Akbar Dareini

AP, March 7, 2007

DOJ_NMG_0141594

Iran said Tuesday its former deputy defense minister was missing while on a private trip to neighboring Turkey, and its top police chief accused Western intelligence services of possibly kidnapping the official.

Ali Reza Asghari, a retired general in the elite Revolutionary Guards and a former deputy defense minister, had arrived in Turkey on a private visit from Damascus, Syria, the official Islamic Republic News Agency reported Tuesday.

Iran's top police chief, Gen. Esmaeil Ahmadi Moghaddam, said Iran was investigating the fate of Asghari through the Turkish police.

"It is likely that Asghari has been abducted by the Western intelligence services," IRNA quoted the Iranian police general as saying. The general did not elaborate.

In Turkey, the Interior Ministry said Tuesday it was investigating the matter, but would not confirm or deny that Asghari had disappeared or been kidnapped.

The Turkish Foreign Ministry had asked the Interior Ministry to investigate following a report from the Iranian Embassy in Ankara.

In Israel, security officials said the country's embassies and consulates had been alerted to possible attacks or kidnappings following media speculation that Israel was behind the Iranian general's disappearance. The security officials spoke on condition of anonymity because such security measures are classified.

The Shin Bet, Israel's security service, would not confirm that embassy security had been ratcheted up, saying only that such decisions were made "in keeping with the developments in intelligence and on the ground."

Alarm Over Iran Helps Bush (LAT)

Max Boot

The Los Angeles Times, March 7, 2007

The U.S. has plenty of reasons to strike, but the administration pushes diplomacy.

IS THAT trigger-happy gunslinger in the White House about to take aim at Iran?

You would think so if you read the Guardian newspaper in Britain, which has written, "Pentagon plans for possible attack on nuclear sites are well advanced."

Not to be outdone, the competing Sunday Times has reported, based on a "source with close ties to British intelligence," that "up to five [U.S.] generals and admirals are willing to resign rather than approve what they consider would be a reckless attack."

Or try the homegrown media, where foreign policy experts of an anti-Bush hue compete to offer elaborate scenarios of how the U.S. could spark a conflagration. American policymakers "intend to be as provocative as possible and make the Iranians do something [the U.S.] would be forced to retaliate for," former National Security Council official Hillary Mann told Newsweek. Another former NSC aide, Flynt Leverett, told the New Yorker, "The idea is that at some point the Iranians will respond, and then the administration will have an open door to strike them." In Senate testimony, former national security advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski conjured up a "plausible scenario for a military collision with Iran," which would be provoked by a "terrorist act" that would be "blamed on Iran," "culminating in a 'defensive' U.S. military action against Iran that plunges a lonely America into a spreading and deepening quagmire."

You would think that the United States was Nazi Germany preparing to launch a war of aggression on Poland based on a fabricated provocation. (Adolf Hitler's Sept. 1, 1939, blitzkrieg was preceded by SS troops in Polish uniforms pretending to attack a German radio station on the border.) In reality, it is the United States and our allies that are the victims in the confrontation with Iran.

Recall that the trouble began with the outrageous Iranian seizure of 52 U.S. Embassy hostages in 1979. Since then, the mullahs have continued to wage war by proxy. Iranian-sponsored terrorists bombed the U.S. Embassy and Marine barracks in Beirut in 1983, killing 258 Americans. They kidnapped numerous Americans in Lebanon. They are suspected of bombing the Khobar Towers complex in Saudi Arabia in 1996, killing 19 Americans. More recently, they have been providing arms and training to anti-American militants in Iraq. Iranian-made EFPs (explosively formed projectiles), a particularly potent type of landmine, have been responsible for more than 170 American combat deaths.

Attempts by numerous naysayers to deny the evidence of Iranian involvement in Iraq are almost comical. American troops at several bases in Iraq have laid out mortars, rockets and bomb components with serial numbers betraying their Iranian origins. They have even detained senior officials of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard's Quds Force, which is responsible for supplying munitions to Iraqi militias.

Yet critics profess to remain unconvinced that all these actions were approved by the Iranian leadership. As if it's common in a dictatorship for the security forces to act contrary to the orders of the dictator. In fact, there is no evidence that the Quds

DOJ_NMG_0141595

Force has gone renegade and much evidence that it is doing the bidding of Iran's supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, to whom it directly reports.

Faced with such a flagrant casus belli, not to mention President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's blood-curdling threats against our ally, Israel, the U.S. would be perfectly justified in hitting Iran now, before it acquires nuclear weapons. But that doesn't necessarily mean that such an attack is the best strategy at the moment or the one that the administration is pursuing.

There is, in fact, little reason to think that we're about to go bombs away. With the U.S. already mired in two major conflicts, the last thing the administration needs is another one. President Bush is trying to ratchet up the pressure on Iran precisely in order to reach a diplomatic settlement and avoid a military confrontation.

As part of this process, the U.S. has won approval from the U.N. for sanctions, and it has also pursued its own unilateral sanctions on Iranian financial networks. There is evidence that these measures are hurting the Iranian leadership and that key elements of the regime are uneasy with Ahmadinejad's bellicose course. But to be effective, the policy of coercion needs to have a military component, which is why the U.S. has moved a second aircraft carrier battle group into the region and rounded up some Iranian agents in Iraq.

Only if the Iranians fear the U.S. are they likely to make major concessions. The Bush haters are thus doing Bush a big favor with all their talk of an imminent American strike. The more alarmism, the better — justified or not.

US, North Korea Optimistic After Talks (AP)

By Edith M. Lederer

AP, March 7, 2007

The United States and North Korea wrapped up historic talks on establishing diplomatic ties on an optimistic note Tuesday but the U.S. wants Pyongyang to "come clean" about any uranium enrichment program and eliminate all nuclear weapons before normalizing relations.

"These were very good, very businesslike, very comprehensive discussions," U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Christopher Hill told reporters at the end of two days of meetings that lasted more than eight hours. "For now, I think we feel we're on the right track."

His North Korean counterpart, Vice Foreign Minister Kim Kye Gwan, was also upbeat, telling reporters "the atmosphere was very good, constructive and serious."

Under a Feb. 13 agreement reached at six-nation talks in Beijing, North Korea must shut down its main nuclear reactor and allow U.N. inspectors back into the country within 60 days. In return, the North would receive aid equal to 50,000 tons of heavy fuel oil from the other countries in the talks — the United States, South Korea, Russia, China and Japan.

Hill said "there was a sense of optimism on both sides that we will get through this 60-day period and we will achieve all of our objectives."

The Feb. 13 timetable is the first step toward implementing a September 2005 agreement in which North Korea agreed to abandon its nuclear programs in exchange for energy aid and security guarantees.

Hill said he was encouraged by Kim's willingness to look ahead to the next stage, which calls for the country's plutonium-producing reactor to be disabled and then dismantled — and for North Korea to make a full disclosure of its entire nuclear program.

Experts estimate North Korea's reactor at Yongbyon, north of the capital, has produced about 110 pounds of plutonium, that "we have reason to believe has been weaponized," Hill said.

U.S. Deputy Secretary of State John Negroponte said Washington also has "no doubt" that North Korea has a uranium enrichment program, an allegation that brought on the nuclear crisis with the North in 2002. Pyongyang has never publicly acknowledged having such a program.

Hill said North Korea spent a lot of money buying centrifuges, manuals, aluminum tubes and other equipment for what appears to be a Pakistani-designed program to enrich uranium, and "they need to come clean on it" and ultimately abandon it.

He told a news conference he "made the point forcefully today" that North Korea cannot denuclearize if highly enriched uranium — which can be used to produce nuclear weapons — "is still out there."

Hill said he and Kim agreed to resolve the matter before North Korea makes its final nuclear declaration and decided that U.S. and North Korean experts will meet in order "to get to the bottom of this matter."

The primary focus of the first meeting of the U.S.-North Korea Working Group, one of five established under the Feb. 13 agreement, was steps toward establishing diplomatic relations.

Hill said Washington looks forward not only to eventual normalization of relations but to creating peace on the Korean peninsula and ensuring security in northeast Asia.

DOJ_NMG_0141596

The United States has never had diplomatic relations with North Korea, which was created after World War II when Korea was split into a communist-dominated North and a U.S.-backed capitalist South.

In Tuesday's talks, Hill said one issue that was discussed was North Korea's desire to get off the U.S. list of state sponsors of terrorism. Another issue was North Korea's desire to get off the list of countries subject to the U.S. Trading with the Enemy Act, which would open the way for a normal trading relationship with the U.S. for the first time.

Speaking of North Korea, Hill said, "I think they would like to move to diplomatic relations, but I must say this is very much linked to denuclearization."

Hill wouldn't predict when the last piece of nuclear material will be taken out of North Korea, but said: "We believe that the faster we go the steadier we'll be."

"Let us do this step-by-step — get through 60 days and take the next thing, which I think is measured in months, and not years, and then go on from there," he said.

Hill said the six parties will meet March 19 in Beijing to make sure that all the required 30-day actions were met, including initial meetings of working groups on five issues.

Japan's chief envoy said Wednesday at the start of two-day working group talks with North Korea that normalizing ties between the two countries will not be possible until the North resolves the issue of its abductions of Japanese citizens — an emotional dispute that has divided the two nations.

"We'll convey that message to the other side and urge them to fully face the problem and take positive steps," Japan's chief envoy Koichi Haraguchi said in Hanoi as he headed for the opening session with his North Korean counterpart, Song Il Ho.

North Korea wants Japan to atone for the 1910-45 colonization of the Korean Peninsula and wartime atrocities, including sex slavery of tens of thousands of Korean women.

Hill said he had a long discussion with Kim about the Japanese abductions and made "a strong pitch" that it was "very important" for North Korea "to reach out and develop relations with Japan."

"I was pleased to see there was a positive understanding," he said.

South Korea's Yonhap news agency reported Tuesday that a senior aide to South Korea's president will visit North Korea this week and speculated his goal was to set up a summit with North Korean leader Kim Jong Il. But officials in Seoul denied a summit was in the works.

U.S. Presses North Korea Over Uranium (NYT)

By Warren Hoge

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

The United States said yesterday that North Korea must fully disclose its efforts to produce highly enriched uranium as part of the negotiations now under way that are aimed at ending North Korea's nuclear weapons program and normalizing relations between the two countries.

"They need to come clean on it, explain what they have been doing, why they have been doing it, and ultimately they would need to abandon it," said Christopher R. Hill, the chief United States negotiator.

Mr. Hill made the remarks to a morning gathering at the Japan Society in New York prior to entering his second day of talks with Kim Kye-gwan, his North Korean counterpart. In a late afternoon briefing after the talks concluded, Mr. Hill said they had been "very good, very businesslike, very comprehensive."

The talks are the first product of a Feb. 13 agreement reached in Beijing in which the government of Kim Jong-il said it would stop, seal and ultimately disable its nuclear facilities in exchange for fuel and other assistance.

While the accord specified that North Korea was required to make a full "declaration" of all of its nuclear activities, the question of the uranium enrichment program in particular arose yesterday because of recent suggestions that the Bush administration may have overstated the reliability of intelligence on the progress that North Korea might have made in enriching uranium.

Last October, North Korea tested its first nuclear device, a weapon made with plutonium. The United States says it believes that North Korea has also been working to develop a device using highly enriched uranium, and it points to the purchase of expensive equipment designed for that purpose that North Korea has made from Pakistan. But recently, government officials said they were no longer as confident that the North built on that purchase and had a uranium program.

Despite the recent doubts about the progress of the program, Mr. Hill said the United States was "owed a pretty clear answer" on why the purchase from Pakistan were made. "It is not unusual for a country going nuclear to go nuclear on two tracks."

DOJ_NMG_0141597

The Feb. 13 accord has come under criticism from American conservatives like John R. Bolton, a former United Nations ambassador, who argue that it rewards North Korea by promising the delivery of fuel and assistance before the country's nuclear capacity is dismantled.

In defending the agreement, Mr. Hill noted that it had been criticized from both the right and the left in the United States for the same reason — that it was no improvement over a 1994 accord known as the Agreed Framework, which was struck by President Clinton, broken by North Korea and later dismissed by President Bush as a mistake.

But Mr. Hill said the new agreement was not just a bilateral accord but one that was endorsed by China and other major countries in Asia. He also noted that it set up working groups with strict deadlines that are to take up issues that go beyond energy.

The working groups, which are meeting in New York and in Beijing this month, will also explore economic assistance for North Korea and a security agreement to cover all of Northeast Asia, Mr. Hill said.

The Feb. 13 accord specifies a 60-day deadline for shutting down Yongbyon, North Korea's main nuclear complex north of the capital, Pyongyang, and allowing inspectors from the International Atomic Energy Agency, the United Nations' nuclear watchdog, back into the country.

Steps to be taken after the 60 days focus on the challenge of getting North Korea to agree to disabling nuclear facilities and verifying the amount of plutonium remaining in the country. "We want to make sure that when the North Koreans give us a declaration, there are no surprises and no omissions," he said.

A meeting was set for March 19 of the six parties that participated in hammering out the recent agreement — North and South Korea, Japan, China, Russia and the United States — to review progress. A mid-April gathering of the countries' foreign ministers will assess progress after 60 days.

Mr. Hill said that in a visit to Washington last week he met with Republican and Democratic senators about the agreement and had received "a great deal of support, enormous support."

But he added, "If we start missing deadlines and things start going badly, some of that support will peel off."

Asked if he feared that North Korea was playing for time and waiting for a more hospitable government in Washington after the next election, he said, "They understand that things aren't going to get better in the next two years." No administration, he said, could ignore the spread of nuclear weapons.

He said he had assured North Korea that the United States was committed to negotiations that would eventually lead to diplomatic relations between the two countries. "I also reaffirmed to them the need for them to fulfill their part of the bargain, which is complete denuclearization," he said.

"To me it makes a lot of sense," he said. "I look at the road that North Korea is on today, and I don't see much future for it on this road."

US Expects N Korea To Come Clean (FT)

By Mark Turner And Song Jung-a

Financial Times, March 7, 2007

Two senior US officials warned on Tuesday that they expected North Korea to give a full explanation of its suspected efforts to highly enrich uranium, suggesting that the evidence remained compelling, in spite of doubts recently aired in Washington.

Christopher Hill, the US negotiator who was meeting in New York with North Korean envoy Kim Kye-gwan, said that while questions remained over how far Pyonyang had progressed, a string of equipment purchases over the years had been consistent with such a programme.

"If they don't have a highly enriched uranium programme, why do they buy all this?" Mr Hill asked, referring to centrifuges and aluminium tubes. "I think we are owed a pretty complete answer as to why these purchases have been made."

John Negroponte, US deputy secretary of state, similarly told a news conference in Seoul: "I have no doubt that North Korea has had a highly enriched uranium programme, and that has been, and continues to be, the judgment of our intelligence community.''

He said the US "would expect that when North Korea makes its declaration of nuclear facilities, that would be one of the issues that would be addressed".

Both statements appeared to be a response to mounting debate in Washington over the existence of such a programme, which North Korea has denied. They also play to criticism that the recent six-party agreement might have let Pyongyang off the hook.

The capacity to highly enrich uranium is important, as it would offer North Korea an alternative route to make nuclear weapons, as opposed to reprocessing plutonium from its Yongbyon reactor – the focus of the latest agreement.

DOJ_NMG_0141598

Joseph DeTrani, an intelligence official, recently told the Senate Armed Services Committee, that “we still have confidence that the [HEU] programme is in existence”, but “at the mid-confidence level”, prompting questions as to the reliability of intelligence on the matter.

Some analysts suggested such toning down of the rhetoric might be part of a strategy to help North Korea save face, to ensure its compliance with its commitment under the deal to abandon its nuclear programme in return for energy aid. But the apparent shift has also sparked counter-criticism that the Bush administration has gone soft on the issue.

In an editorial in the Wall Street Journal, John Bolton, the former US ambassador to the UN and a hawk on disarmament matters, suggested Mr DeTrani’s statement reflected a lack of new information rather than discrediting of earlier intelligence. “There has been no suggestion that the intelligence from 2002 and earlier has been contradicted,” he wrote. “There is nothing here to allow anyone to conclude that the 2002 intelligence conclusions were flawed or hyped.”

Mr Bolton warned that it was crucial not to let up the pressure. “North Korea’s aggressive mendacity puts it near the top of the list, perhaps tied with Iran for the lead, of countries that need the most transparent, most intrusive, most pervasive verification mechanisms,” he said. “For America to agree to anything less would be to make our national security . . . dependent on North Korea’s word.”

U.S. Tells N. Korea To 'Come Clean' (WT)

By Nicholas Kralev

The Washington Times, March 7, 2007

The chief U.S. negotiator with North Korea predicted yesterday that the North will meet its obligations under the first phase of last month's agreement to shut down its nuclear programs, but warned that the next stage will be much more difficult.

Christopher Hill said after two days of talks in New York with his North Korean counterpart, Kim Kye-gwan, that Pyongyang must "come clean" on its suspected uranium-enrichment efforts before any final disarmament declaration is adopted.

"There was a sense of optimism on both sides that we will get through this 60-day period and will achieve all of our objectives that are set out in the Feb. 13 agreement," said Mr. Hill, the assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific affairs.

The North Koreans "are prepared to live up to all their obligations in the 60-day period," he said. The Feb. 13 accord requires the North to shut down its Yongbyon nuclear reactor and allow U.N. inspectors to verify the closure within that time frame.

On a parallel track, Japan and North Korea started their first formal bilateral talks in more than a year today, aiming to end an emotional row over Pyongyang's abductions of Japanese citizens and to normalize relations.

Diplomats meeting in the Vietnamese capital Hanoi agreed to spend today on the issue of the kidnappings in the 1970s and '80s and to work tomorrow toward normalizing ties in talks at both the Japanese and North Korean embassies.

Tokyo has refused, due to the kidnapping row, to help fund the landmark Feb. 13 deal struck in Beijing.

Mr. Hill urged the North Koreans, as well as the other four participants in the six-party talks that produced the February agreement -- China, South Korea, Japan and Russia -- to "immediately get into the next phase" in mid-April and "not lose any momentum."

He warned that the second stage will be more difficult because it deals with disabling the North's facilities so that they cannot be turned back on again.

The New York talks marked the beginning of work on normalizing U.S.-North Korean diplomatic relations, one of five working groups set up by the Feb. 13 deal. All five must meet by mid-March and Mr. Hill said some of them may be pushing the deadline.

Other groups dealing with denuclearization, energy and economic assistance, and Northeast Asian security will convene in Beijing next week.

The foreign ministers of all six countries are expected to meet in Beijing in mid-April.

Mr. Hill said he and Mr. Kim had held an "in-depth discussion" of the historical and legal aspects of establishing diplomatic relations and taking the North off the U.S. list of state sponsors of terrorism.

"I wanted to understand better what happened in the 1990s from their perspective, when there was discussion of opening liaison offices" in both capitals, he said.

He added that Mr. Kim had raised a possible visit to Pyongyang by Mr. Hill "in general terms," but they made no plans. In July, Mr. Hill told The Washington Times that he would not go to North Korea while the Yongbyon reactor is still operating.

Yesterday, he echoed a call by Deputy Secretary of State John D. Negroponte for North Korea to declare its uranium program during the second phase of the Feb. 13 deal in order to maintain trust.

DOJ_NMG_0141599

"If, for some reason, it were to conceal its nuclear facilities or not declare facilities, and if they were then discovered at some later date, it would have the effect of undermining confidence in this entire arrangement," Mr. Negroponte said during a visit to Seoul.

The Bush administration accused the North in 2002 of secretly developing a program to enrich uranium, but recently it has expressed reduced confidence that the program is still operational. The North Koreans have never publicly admitted to having the program, although the administration says they acknowledged it in a private meeting.

In a further sign of thawing relations between Washington and Pyongyang, American tourists have been invited to visit North Korea.

The Beijing-based, British-run agency Koryo Tours announced that, from April 15 to May 15, it has been given permission to take U.S. tourists into the secretive state. This will be only the fourth time U.S. tourists have been allowed to visit North Korea since 1993, the agency said.

The company has privileged access to North Korea. Its contacts have allowed it to make several documentary films in the North, including last year's "Crossing the Line," about the last U.S. defector still alive in Pyongyang.

·Andrew Salmon contributed to this report from Seoul.

Unofficial Deal Offers Peace (WT)

By David R. Sands

The Washington Times, March 7, 2007

Israel could convert a privately negotiated blueprint into a lasting peace deal with Syria within months if Prime Minister Ehud Olmert is willing to take the political risk, a key Israeli drafter of the plan said yesterday.

Alon Liel, director general of the Israeli Foreign Ministry under former Prime Minister Ehud Barak, said he thinks Syria remains interested in the outlines of the unofficial deal, the product of two years of secret, unofficial contacts monitored closely by both the Jewish state and Damascus.

Under the accord, Syria would recover the Golan Heights from Israel in exchange for a "strategic reorientation" of its foreign policy that would include breaking its links with Iran and radical anti-Israel Islamist groups.

"If Israel wanted, they could finalize an agreement with Syria in four to six months, but it would take courage and decisiveness at the top," Mr. Liel said in a teleconference with U.S. reporters. "I'm not sure is prepared to do it."

Both Syria and Israel have vehemently denied that private talks had any official status and played down speculation that a new round of negotiations was in the offing. The Jerusalem daily Ha'aretz first reported the back-channel talks in January.

"We have never sanctioned anybody to speak to the Syrians, and the prime minister first learned of these conversations through the newspaper report," Olmert spokeswoman Miri Eisen said.

But Mr. Liel said he and his negotiating counterpart, Syrian-American Ibrahim Suleiman, regularly briefed top officials in their respective governments on the progress of the talks, which took place first in Turkey and then under Swiss government auspices between 2004 and mid-2006.

Mr. Liel said the plan has had an enthusiastic reception in Israel, especially among pro-peace leftist groups. He and Mr. Suleiman have been invited to brief a Knesset committee next month on the substance of the agreement.

Mr. Liel said the secret contacts broke off last summer when Israel rejected a Syrian offer to upgrade the talks by sending official government representatives.

Under the blueprint, Syria would regain the entire Golan Heights area lost to Israel in the 1967 Six-Day War, with the Israeli withdrawal to be completed within five to 15 years.

But Syria would then create a demilitarized "nature park" in the Golan, guaranteeing access for Israeli workers and tourists and promising not to cut vital water rights for Israel.

More important, Mr. Liel said, Syria is prepared to drop its alliance with Iran and end its support for radical movements such as Hezbollah in Lebanon and Hamas in the Palestinian territories. Khalid Mashaal, political leader of Hamas, would be asked to leave Damascus, where he is based.

Israel, in turn, would work to improve ties between Syria and the United States. The Bush administration has clashed repeatedly with Syrian President Bashar Assad, accusing Damascus of trying to undermine U.S.-backed governments in Iraq and Lebanon and aiding Iran's push to dominate the region.

Mr. Liel said a deal with Syria would be a tough sell politically in Israel right now, but said Israeli officials told him a bigger obstacle during the secret talks was opposition from Washington.

"Their excuse was always, 'We don't want to embarrass the United States at this stage,'" he said.

Syria Seeks To Gain From Regional Tumult (CSM)

DOJ_NMG_0141600

By Nicholas Blanford

The Christian Science Monitor, March 7, 2007

BEIRUT, LEBANON

Iraq is where the war is. Iran is where the disputed nuclear program is. And Lebanon is where America's friends in the Middle East are going head-to-head with its enemies.

Yet it's in Syria where the threads of these conflicts come together.

The country that the Bush administration says helps terrorists, and which has been treated with barely disguised irritation by fellow Arab states in recent years, is seeking to trade on the impression it can provide at least partial solutions to some of the region's most pressing problems. Though weaker than Iran or Saudi Arabia, the country represents a crucial element in a triangle of interlocking regional powers.

"The [Syrian] state always calls Syria the 'beating heart of Arabism,' and it's true in the sense that Syria, by geography and sectarian makeup, is key to what's going on in the region, especially the concerns over spreading Iranian influence," says Andrew Tabler, a Damascus-based fellow with the Institute of Current World Affairs.

Though the US has refused to talk directly to Syria, demanding that Damascus cease meddling in Iraq, Lebanon, and the Palestinian territories first, the regime's isolation appears to be crumbling.

Relations with neighboring Iraq have improved with the formal restoration of diplomatic ties in December and the signing of a joint security agreement. American senators have recently traveled to Damascus and a State Department official is planning a visit to discuss the plight of Iraqi refugees.

Syrian interests also were high on the agenda of a meeting last weekend between Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and Saudi King Abdullah.

Syria looking for a Hariri deal

In recent days, there were hopes among Lebanese government officials and opposition figures that Iran – which uses Damascus as its strategic linchpin to Hizbullah in Lebanon – had worked out a deal with Saudi Arabia – a political and financial backer of Lebanon's government – to end a three-month old political deadlock.

But local media report that Saudi officials have since played down hopes of a quick resolution. Both sides recognize that any deal would have to ease pressure on Syria over its suspected involvement in the murder of former Lebanese Prime Minister Rafik Hariri two years ago. That could mean Lebanese approval for a watered-down international tribunal on Hariri's murder, sparing top Syrian officials from indictment. In exchange, Syria would lean on Hizbullah and other Lebanese opposition members to call off their bid to topple the governing coalition.

Syria's ability to potentially scuttle unfavorable deals brokered by the regional powerhouses of Saudi Arabia and Iran underlines Riyadh's irritation with Damascus – as well as the risks of ignoring the Syrians.

"The Saudis continue to be annoyed with Damascus.... All the same, the Saudis understand that for Middle Eastern tensions to be reduced, Syria must be brought into negotiations," says Joshua Landis, a codirector of the University of Oklahoma's Center of Peace Studies and a specialist on Syria.

Last month, Saudi Arabia hosted a meeting between Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas and Hamas leader Khaled Meshaal, who lives in Damascus. The meeting produced an agreement on a Palestinian national unity government, and served as a calculated swipe at Damascus by undercutting Syria's influence on Palestinian affairs. It was a reminder, analysts say, that Syria's neighbors expect much in return for any concessions, and that if they don't get it, they'll turn on Syria again. Saudi Arabia is hoping Syria will return to the Arab fold – or at least move away from the orbit of Persian Iran – at the annual meeting of the 22-member Arab League later this month.

Iran and Syria's surprising relationship

"If Syria does not take steps to fix the causes of its problems with Saudi Arabia, then the Arab summit will not save Syria from a dark future.... Syria is responsible for its own encirclement," wrote Abdul Rahman al-Rashed, in the Saudi Al-Sharq Al-Awsat newspaper.

The 27-year relationship between secular Syria and Islamic Iran is one of the most enduring – and surprising – in the Middle East. The bilateral bond is the core of an anti-Western alliance which includes Hizbullah, Hamas and a collection of smaller Palestinian groups.

"The relationship between Iran and Syria has evolved from a pragmatic one into a ... strategic and ideological one," says Amal Saad-Ghorayeb of the Carnegie Middle East Center in Beirut. It's "ideological because they resist politically or militarily US hegemony in the region and the threat from Israel."

Iran, aware that a rapprochement between Syria and the West would isolate it from Hizbullah and undermine Tehran's ability to influence the Arab-Israeli conflict, is working hard to prevent that from happening. Iran has recently proposed $1-3 billion in Syria investments.

"If those investments are implemented over the next two to three years, it will allow Iran to replace or offset a lot of the influence Saudi Arabia traditionally has had in Syria," says Mr. Tabler of the Institute of Current World Affairs.

The relationship with Iran has divided expert opinion in the US and Israel. Some advocate a full reengagement with Syria and peace talks which could see the Israeli-occupied Golan Heights returned to Syria. "Peace with Israel and the return of the Golan are the only prizes which might make Damascus reconsider the advantages of its close relationship with Iran," says Mr. Landis.

Others insist such efforts won't succeed in prying Syria away from Iran. "It makes no sense for Syria to split from Iran," says Ms. Saad- Ghorayeb. "It appears much more in Syria's strategic interests to remain allied with an ascendant power in the region rather than an alliance with a waning power [in the region] like the US."

Official: Olmert, Abbas To Meet Next Week (AP)

By Steve Weizman

AP, March 7, 2007

Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert and Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas will meet next week for their second summit in a month, but this one will focus on humanitarian matters rather than the core issues of the Mideast dispute, an Olmert aide said Tuesday.

The meeting is expected to be held before Abbas' Fatah Party and the militant Hamas group form a unity government, which likely will complicate relations between the two sides.

"We expect them to meet next week, although an exact date has yet to be set," Olmert spokeswoman Miri Eisin said. "It's important to keep up with these meetings in order to keep open the channel of communication."

The two leaders met Feb. 19 along with Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice. The Israeli daily Maariv said the coming meeting would be one-on-one, with Rice possibly coming later in March for separate meetings with the leaders.

Maariv said Olmert would try to strengthen personal ties with Abbas, while seeking to persuade him to back off his newly forged alliance with the militant Hamas.

Palestinian negotiator Saeb Erekat said the two sides had not completed preparations and no final date had been set for an Abbas-Olmert meeting. He said he hoped the two leaders could meet "in the near future."

Last month's summit produced few results amid Israeli and U.S. concerns over the planned Fatah-Hamas unity government. Rice reported no progress in restarting talks on a final peace deal, the ostensible purpose of the meeting when it was announced.

The power sharing deal between Fatah and Hamas, which controls the Palestinian parliament, appeared to fall short of international demands that the government recognize Israel, accept previous peace deals and renounce violence. The deal only says the government will "respect" past peace agreements.

Despite the accord, Abbas and Palestinian Prime Minister Ismail Haniyeh, of Hamas, have so far failed to agree on the composition of a unity government, and street fighting between the two sides has flared up again.

After an inconclusive session Monday, Abbas and Haniyeh were expected to meet again Tuesday to discuss the crucial issue of who would be interior minister, who controls security forces.

Olmert's own ability to maneuver is tenuous. After an inconclusive war last summer in Lebanon, his approval rating has plummeted below 20 percent, leaving him politically unable to carry out far-reaching concessions that would be needed for a peace deal.

He is also under constant public pressure to end continuing rocket attacks by Palestinian militants from Gaza into southern Israel. Four Israeli civilians were injured Tuesday by rocket fire, the military said.

The attacks, which have triggered extensive Israeli army raids into Gaza in the past, killed four Israelis in southern Israel last year.

Palestinians See Growing Food Shortages (CSM)

By Joshua Mitnick

The Christian Science Monitor, March 7, 2007

KALANDIA REFUGEE CAMP, WEST BANK

The refrigerator in the Shiham household is bare save for a container of cheese, a bucket of tomatoes, and some wrinkled cucumbers. The meat in the freezer is rationed as the family of eight lives on handouts and intermittent welfare stipends.

"Every two weeks, we eat meat. When the children miss it, we have it," says Douaa Shiham, a widowed mother of seven who often sends her children to school with no lunch. "I have no say in what we eat. I wait for the charity to come."

DOJ_NMG_0141602

A sign of economic deterioration in the West Bank and Gaza, the growing pressure on the Shiham family reflects a crisis that affects one-third of all Palestinians and threatens another 12 percent, according to a study by a division of the United Nations World Food Programme (WFP).

Families like the Shihams in this Palestinian refugee camp have coped with poverty even before Hamas took power in January 2006. But human rights workers and the families themselves say that conditions have grown much worse in the aftermath of the international economic boycott of the government led by the Islamist militants.

Humanitarian groups call it "food insecurity," a predicament in which a family lacks the money to purchase the food necessary to meet basic needs.

While the WFP says that food insecurity has remained steady at 34 percent, the organization has had to increase the number of beneficiaries of its food aid program by 25 percent to 600,000 Palestinians to stave off a broader crisis.

The problem is most acute in Gaza, where Israeli security clampdowns at commercial and civilian crossings have pushed unemployment to 39 percent and exposed 54 percent of 1.4 million Gazans to food insecurity, according to the WFP.

Once a month, WFP food aid recipients get a shipment of flour, sugar, oil, chickpeas, beans, salt, and canned meat, though it is often insufficient because families of 10 often get rations based on a family of seven.

Since her husband died nearly a year and a half ago, Mrs. Shiham and her children have become dependent on payouts of 500 shekels ($120) every three months. When the donors to the Palestinian Authority (PA) initiated an aid boycott last spring because of Hamas's refusal to recognize Israel, the stipends from the social welfare ministry became more infrequent, coming just every six months.

Shiham also made the round of local Islamic charities, but some were shut down by the Israeli army on suspicion they had served as a financial conduit for Hamas.

Breakfast for the family consists of tea, bread, and olive oil. Lunch is often rice and lentils. Though Shiham can afford vegetables if she buys leftover produce at discount prices, she rarely has money for fruit.

"My kids love apples and they love bananas," she says. "Today, my son asked for apples, and I said, 'I don't have the money.' I started thinking, 'How am I going to get money for apples?' "

Though the international sanctions were aimed at the Hamas-led government, because the Palestinian economy is so dependent on public spending, per capita growth declined as much as 10 percent in 2006, according to a preliminary estimate by the World Bank. The reversal of three consecutive years of growth was also affected by a rise in security closures around Gaza and West Bank cities.

Israel argues that despite the security measures to protect its citizens against terrorist attacks, it is doing everything it can to ease the suffering of the Palestinian population.

"We are committed to working with the international community to ensure there are no food shortages in the territories," says Mark Regev, a spokesman for the Israeli Foreign Ministry. "No one wants to see innocent Palestinians pay the price of an extremist and shortsighted Palestinian government."

But Daphna Golan, a researcher at Hebrew University's Minerva Center for Human Rights, argued that Israel needs to loosen restrictions of Palestinian movement to allow the Palestinian economy to grow. "If we want a normal future here," she says, "we don't want neighbors who are hungry."

In Ramallah, signs of the desperation can be seen at traffic intersections and in automobile queues at Israeli checkpoints, where there has been an increase in the number of children hawking merchandise like gum and plastic toys to earn pocket change.

"People want their kids to start bringing in income," says Jamil Rabah, an independent pollster who studies food insecurity for the WFP. "It's close to begging."

The food distress is reflected by cutbacks in the quantity and quality of food purchased. It has also prompted Palestinians to cut corners on items normally considered essential, like education and medical services.

"They keep their bellies full at the expense of not going to the doctor," Mr. Rabah says. "Food remains the last resort because food is living."

The WFP defines the Palestinian poverty line at a total expenditure of $2 per person per day. Those who suffer from food insecurity only have $1.60 per day to spend.

In the Kalandia Refugee Camp, Rubin Hussein flipped through ledgers that list the debts of his customers. They owe him nearly $20,000. Consumption has plummeted, and those who still buy are forced to purchase frozen meat.

"People don't eat high-quality meat," he says. "They go for the cheaper meat."

With a 500-shekel debt of her own at the butcher, Shiham says she hasn't been to the shop in two months. All of the meat in the refrigerator was donated by relatives during a recent holiday.

DOJ_NMG_0141603

When her children ask her why classmates eat chicken schnitzel and bologna for lunch while they make do with bread and hyssop, there is not much to say: "I tell them, 'I can't give you.' "

EU, Egypt Sign €558m Reform Package (FT)

By Andrew England And Daniel Dombey

Financial Times, March 7, 2007

Egypt and the European Union on Tuesday launched a reform package that Brussels hopes will push the country towards democratisation – despite a recent crackdown by Egyptian authorities on opposition members and concerns about the government's will to carry out political changes.

The plan, which includes a four-year €558m assistance package, was agreed after months of negotiations during which the EU sought to convince Egypt to accept a new forum in which to discuss democracy and human rights.

But despite the agreement to establish a regular "dialogue" on such issues, Egypt made clear on Tuesday that it would move forward only at its own rhythm.

"These are issues related to Egypt and Egypt will do them according to its own pace," said Aboul Gheit, Egypt's foreign minister, referring to subjects such as judicial reform and constitutional changes.

"The Europeans are encouraging such commitment on our part but it is an Egyptian decision."

Included among the agreed "priorities for joint co-operation" between Egypt and the EU are support for political reform, promoting the protection of human rights and ensuring judicial independence and expanding "participation in political life." The EU is Egypt's biggest trading partner and second-biggest donor.

But human rights activists say recent events in Egypt have highlighted the government's lack of will to move forward with genuine political reform, as well as serious human rights issues.

Since December, authorities have launched a series of raids against members of the Muslim Brotherhood, which is the country's strongest and most organised opposition group in spite of being legally banned.

Some 170 Brotherhood members are currently being detained, brotherhood officials say. Last month, an Egyptian blogger was sentenced to four years in prison on charges of insulting Islam, defaming Hosni Mubarak, the president, and "spreading information disruptive of the public order".

Some activists argue that draft proposals of amendments to the constitution - which have appeared in the local press - will weaken the judiciary's role in monitoring elections and further hinder the Muslim Brotherhood's ability to compete in polls.

The government, however, has insisted the changes are intended to foster greater democracy.

"There's no progress. Most observers see there is no will for real political or constitutional reform," said Hafez Abu Seada, secretary general of the Egyptian Organisation for Human Rights.

Examples of police abuse and the torture of detainees – which critics say is endemic in Egypt - have also surfaced this year.

The EU argues that its longstanding policy towards the region contrasts with the US's more dramatic endorsement of Middle East democratisation in the aftermath of the Iraq war, but largely anticipated Washington's current, more incrementalist approach.

"It's by deepening our relationship with our neighbours that we create the framework and the kind of partnership in which we can discuss these issues and support each country's own reform programme," said a spokeswoman for Benita Ferrero-Waldner, EU external relations commissioner.

The EU's neighbourhood policy is designed to strengthen trade and political relations with nearby countries and enhance cooperation in areas including counter-terrorism, energy and democratic rights.

U.S. Releases Rights Report, With An Acknowledgment (NYT)

By Helene Cooper

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

WASHINGTON, March 6 — The Bush administration acknowledged Tuesday that its treatment of terrorism suspects was being questioned, even as it used an annual report to criticize the human rights records of Iraq, Afghanistan and a long list of other countries.

"Our democratic system of governance is accountable, but it is not infallible," Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice said in releasing the Congressionally mandated report. It weighs the human rights situation in 193 countries — but not the United States, and Ms. Rice did not specifically cite any American violations.

DOJ_NMG_0141604

But Barry Lowenkron, an assistant secretary of state, said the State Department was “issuing this report at a time when our own record, and actions we have taken to respond to terrorist attacks against us, have been questioned.” He referred to American laws “governing the detention, treatment and trial of terrorist suspects.”

Officials from countries that are often cited in the report have complained that the United States is quick to criticize others for violations that sometimes occur in America, and the remarks on Tuesday, one White House official said, were an attempt to answer those charges. In particular, the administration has come under fire from human rights groups for its treatment of prisoners at Guantánamo Bay, Cuba.

The report described serious problems in countries with close ties to the United States, and cited worsening sectarian violence in Iraq. “On one side, predominantly Sunni Arab groups such as Al Qaeda in Iraq, irreconcilable remnants of the Baathist regime, and insurgents waging guerrilla warfare violently opposed the government and targeted Shi’a communities,” the report said. But on “the other, predominantly Shi’a militias with some ties to the Iraqi Security Forces (ISF) targeted Sunnis in large-scale death squad and kidnapping activities,” it added.

The report also found that respect for human rights had deteriorated in China, Russia, Venezuela and Egypt. It said the Chinese government had “tightened restrictions on freedom of speech and the press, including stricter control and censorship of the Internet.” China also continued to detain members of the banned Falun Gong spiritual group, as well as other political activists, the report said.

“There was an increased number of high-profile cases involving the monitoring, harassment, detention and imprisonment of political and religious activists, journalists and writers as well as defense lawyers seeking to exercise their rights under the law,” the report said. “Some of their family members also were harassed and detained.”

China had the dubious distinction of being lumped in one section of the report alongside a number of governments that are in disfavor with the United States. That group included North Korea, Myanmar, Iran, Zimbabwe and Cuba, all herded together under a heading that read, in part, “Countries in which power remained concentrated in the hands of unaccountable rulers — whether totalitarian or authoritarian.”

North Korea was criticized for controlling citizens’ lives and for denying freedom of speech, the press, assembly and association. The military government of Myanmar, formerly known as Burma, the report said, “extensively used executions, rape, torture, arbitrary detention and forced relocation of entire villages, particularly of ethnic minorities, to maintain its grip on power.

Iran violated freedom of speech and assembly, Zimbabwe “continued across-the-board violations of human rights,” and Cuba “continued to violate virtually all the rights of its citizens, including the fundamental right to change their government peacefully or criticize the revolution or its leaders.”

State Dept. Human Rights Report Faults China's Curbs On Internet (WP)

By Nora Boustany

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

China is at the top of a list of countries blocking Internet access, and Russia and Venezuela have shown serious regression in several areas, mainly in centralizing power in the executive branch, according to State Department officials who released the department's annual human rights report yesterday.

On Sudan, the report outlined evidence that genocide continues to ravage the western region of Darfur, and said the Khartoum government and its militias were responsible for it, despite violations of humanitarian law by all sides in that conflict. "It is inconceivable to me to say we've moved away from the issue of genocide," said Barry F. Lowenkron, assistant secretary of state for democracy, human rights and labor, speaking at a State Department briefing. He is heading to Darfur and Khartoum tomorrow.

In addition to its traditional focus on the repression of political liberties around the world, this year's report addressed Internet freedom and the issue of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) that are being harassed while carrying out their missions.

"Today, people are imprisoned in a number of countries simply for expressing their peaceful views online," said Paula Dobriansky, undersecretary for democracy and global rights. She said numerous repressive regimes were threatening the Internet's ability to empower individuals and obstructing its "transformational power."

Lowenkron called 2006 "the year of the pushback" because a surprising number of countries selectively applied regulations against NGOs and the mass media as the drive for personal and political freedoms grew stronger.

He put China at the top of the list of countries putting restrictions on the Internet. Human rights in China have "deteriorated on a number of areas," with no action on promised legal reforms or changes in courtroom proceedings, and a continued "system of reeducation through labor." Thousands of demonstrations in the countryside showed that people were seeking redress and that accountability was still lacking, he added.

DOJ_NMG_0141605

Russia continued to centralize power in the executive branch through changes in election and political party laws as it was tightening restrictions on NGOs and limiting freedom of expression, the report said. In Venezuela, the government of President Hugo Chavez continued to harass the opposition and NGOs, and to weaken judicial independence by packing the courts, while consolidating power in the executive, the report said.

Human rights groups such as Amnesty International, the Washington Office on Latin America and New York-based Human Rights First took issue with the administration for failing to address its own failings in well-documented cases of detainee abuse, extrajudicial renditions, secret prisons and torture.

Larry Cox, Amnesty International's executive director, said that although the report correctly points out that Egypt, for example, continues to use torture, "how can the U.S. have any credibility in trying to stop torture in Egypt when the whole world and we know what it does not mention -- our role in sending people to be tortured, extradited and jailed. . . . How can we criticize regimes for holding people in indefinite detention while we ourselves are holding people in indefinite detention?"

These were "striking and disturbing omissions," he said, accusing the United States of "hypocrisy." While documenting the practices of allies such as Turkey, Egypt, Ethiopia, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, Colombia and others, "we have done very little and we have not spoken out publicly about disappearances, for example," he said. In Iraq, he said, the United States neither talks about its role in certain abuses nor criticizes the judicial process there, although the report noted that certain institutions in Iraq remain weak. While the State Department monitors abuses that would cast a bad light on others, "we hope the U.S. will begin to cast the same light on itself."

Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice noted in brief remarks to reporters yesterday that the United States was not beyond reproach, but did not provide details.

"We do not issue these reports because we think ourselves perfect, but rather because we know ourselves to be deeply imperfect, like all human beings and the endeavors that they make," she said.

"Our democratic system of governance is accountable, but it is not infallible," she said, adding, "We are nonetheless guided by enduring ideals."

Liberia, with a democratically elected government led by Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, Africa's first elected female head of state, was commended for taking significant steps to correct past human rights deficiencies, though challenges remain.

On Indonesia, the report noted a reduction in killings by armed forces, but said the government and the courts were unable to confront past human rights abuses and atrocities at home and in East Timor.

Though problems persisted in Morocco, its record showed notable progress with the enactment of new laws, the report said. Sexual exploitation and child labor remain issues of concern.

The congressionally mandated report -- 1,800 pages distributed electronically -- detailed violations and improvements in 196 countries.

Russia 'right To Fear UK-based Missiles' (FT)

By Demetri Sevastopulo And Jan Cienski

Financial Times, March 7, 2007

Russia would have legitimate cause for concern if the Pentagon placed missile interceptors in Britain as part of its missile defence shield, the head of the US Missile Defence Agency has told the FT.

The Pentagon is negotiating with Poland over the possibility of installing 10 missile interceptors as part of its ground-based missile defence system. But UK officials recently said Tony Blair, the British prime minister, had lobbied the US to have his country host the interceptors.

"If they [the Russians] are concerned about us targeting their intercontinental ballistic missiles, I think that would be problematic from the UK because I believe we probably could catch them from a UK launch site," said Lieutenant General Trey Obering.

Gen Obering said the missile defence system in Europe was aimed at protecting the US and Europe from Iranian missiles. He said the fact that the Pentagon wanted to place the interceptors in Poland reinforced the argument that the US was not trying to build a shield against Russian missiles.

"We would not have chosen Poland or the Czech Republic if our criteria were to try to somehow offset the Russian ICBM advantage," Gen Obering said.

"We would have moved it farther west so that we could again give us more time to do that tracking and targeting."

Moscow has raised alarms about the plans to place interceptors in Poland and a radar in the Czech Republic. Two senior Russian generals have suggested that Russia could target any missile defence facilities in the former Soviet bloc countries.

DOJ_NMG_0141606

The Polish government has responded positively to the US request to begin negotiating towards hosting the interceptors. Recent reports that Britain is also interested in hosting the base have been widely discounted in Warsaw, where they are seen as a negotiating tactic by Washington to encourage the Poles to approve the base.

Gen Obering himself admits that the UK would not be the "optimum" location for interceptors if the idea is to defend against Iranian missiles.

Riki Ellison, the president of the Missile Defense Advocacy Alliance, says the fact that the UK would not be a "feasible" location suggests London was helping Washington put pressure on the Polish government.

While the Polish government favours the base, a recent survey found that only 28 per cent of the public supports the base, while 55 per cent are opposed. The country's political elite feels that a US base, complete with American soldiers, would provide more security to Poland than its current Nato membership.

Asked about the recent successful Chinese test of an anti-satellite missile, Gen Obering said Beijing did not have the capability at present to threaten the US missile defence system, which relies heavily on satellites, but he said that could change in the future.

Gen Obering added that the US was developing programmes that could be used to tackle the growing Chinese threat. But he dec-lined to provide details, saying: "Most of that stuff is classified".

How Missile Defence Pits The Pentagon Against Allies (FT)

By Demetri Sevastopulo

Financial Times, March 7, 2007

As Americans enjoyed their Independence Day fireworks last year, Lieutenant General Trey Obering, the Pentagon's Missile Defence Agency chief, was watching the pyrotechnics display that Kim Jong-il was providing thousands of miles away in North Korea.

The air force general thought the launch by Pyongyang of its previously untested Taepodong-2, an intercontinental ballistic missile with the potential to reach the US, could even provide the first live use of America's ballistic missile defence system.

"We had turned the system on before but it was the first time that there was a credible threat," says Gen Obering. The North Korean authorities "had put a missile out there that we felt was capable of reaching the US, and they were not telling us what was on top of that missile".

The Taepodong-2 failed just seconds into flight. But eight months on, what refuses to die down is the controversy over the Pentagon programme itself, in particular its roll-out to eastern Europe. Despite enduring doubts about the scale of both the threat facing the US and the efficacy of missile defence, Washington's wish to place interceptors for the system in Poland and radars in the Czech Republic has provoked a furious response from Russia and signs of cracks within Nato.

While the US argues that missile defence is essential to deal with the 21st century prospect of rogue states – such as North Korea or Iran – becoming armed with weapons of mass destruction, Moscow protests that the Pentagon's scheme amounts to a remilitarisation of Europe.

The governments of much of central and eastern Europe are sympathetic to Washington plans, as is Tony Blair: Britain's prime minister has sought to lobby for the UK to be included in the scheme (it already hosts a radar site). But continental western Europe is much more nervous about the tensions that missile defence has inflamed.

Last month, at a gathering of the transatlantic elite in Munich, Russian President Vladimir Putin lashed out in a polemical speech that resurrected images of the shoe-banging days of Nikita Khrushchev, the former Soviet leader. "Plans to expand certain elements of the anti-missile defence system to Europe cannot help but disturb us," he said as Robert Gates, US defence secretary, sat just metres away. "Who needs the next step of what would be, in this case, an inevitable arms race?"

Two senior Russian generals subsequently said Moscow might target the two former east bloc countries and withdraw from the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces Treaty, a landmark arms control agreement. Germany has plunged into the debate too, calling for the US to consult Russia more over the missile defence programme, principally in the Nato Russia Council, a forum made up of Moscow and the 26 Nato member states. "Nato is the best place for discussion of this issue," Angela Merkel, German chancellor, told the Financial Times this week.

Jean Asselborn, Luxembourg foreign minister, went further by labelling the US plans "incomprehensible". He told a European Union foreign ministers' meeting: "We'll have no stability in Europe if we force Russia into a corner." Such comments met an icy response from Mirek Topolanek, Czech prime minister. "As for the 18 EU member states who host US military bases, it is not up to them to comment on the existence of such a presence in the Czech Republic," he observed during a visit to Nato headquarters in Brussels.

Propelled back into the spotlight, Gen Obering has been attempting to reassure Moscow that the European-based missile defence system was aimed at threats in the Middle East such as Iran. In an interview, he says Russia has no reason for alarm.

DOJ_NMG_0141607

Russia's large fleet of ICBMs could easily overwhelm the 10 missile interceptors the US hopes to place in Poland. In any event, that would be the wrong location to defend against Russian missiles, because of a lack of "battle space" – the time needed to detect a missile launch, point a radar towards the incoming missile, lock on to it and pass the target information to the interceptor missile for launch. "We would not have chosen Poland or the Czech Republic if our criterion was to try to somehow offset the Russian ICBM advantage," says the general.

The Pentagon has justified missile defence in Europe on the basis that Iranian missiles may pose a threat to Europe and the US. Some argue that Iran is years away from fielding long-range missiles capable of reaching the US. Gen Obering says merely that the US has to prepare for that day, adding that North Korea surprised many experts when it fired a Taepodong-1 rocket over Japan in 1998.

He says the growing number of countries with long-range missiles means that the notion of mutually assured destruction that helped the US and Soviet Union avoid nuclear war may not always apply. "There may be countries where [deterrence] does not work because they are not operating from the same set of criteria that you are . . . what I would call the nation-state equivalent of a suicide bomber."

Some non-proliferation advocates agree that the US should proceed with missile defence, while also undertaking stronger efforts to curb missile proliferation. "Even the crude terminal defences we are thinking of placing in Europe should prove to be of some value against the first-generation missiles Iran is developing and this sort of defence will help keep Nato glued together as it faces a series of Middle Eastern and Gulf security challenges in the coming decades," says Henry Sokolski, executive director of the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center.

In addition to questions about the potency of threats, the Pentagon has also had to rebut charges that the rudimentary system would be incapable of destroying missiles that use counter-measures, such as decoy balloons or multiple warheads. Gen Obering says it is "true to a degree" that the current system is incapable of protecting against complex threats. But he says critics need to recognise that technology has "caught up with the vision".

He is referring to a 1983 speech by the late Ronald Reagan where the then president launched his Strategic Defence Initiative – more commonly known as "Star Wars" – with the question: "What if free people could live secure in the knowledge...that we could intercept and destroy strategic ballistic missiles before they reached our own soil or that of our allies?"

Since the Reagan "call for a bold defence", Congress has provided more than $100bn (£52bn, €76bn) in funding. But as the Pentagon realised the almost impossible task of neutralising any Russian threat with missile defence, the aims of missile defence have been scaled back from the level of sophistication or scale of deployment envisaged by Reagan.

President George W. Bush acted to accelerate missile defence in 2002 when he withdrew the US from the Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty, which had prevented the Pentagon from developing a comprehensive missile defence system. What the Pentagon is now trying to create is a layered missile defence system, deployed across the globe and capable of destroying ballistic missiles in the boost, mid-course and terminal phases of flight.

Some aspects are more ambitious than others. The Missile Defence Agency is pushing Congress to fund an airborne laser and a kinetic energy interceptor that would target missiles in the boost phase – the optimum time to intercept an incoming missile before it is capable of releasing multiple warheads or decoys. To target short- and medium range missiles in the terminal phase, the Pentagon has deployed Patriot Advanced Capability-3 missiles in the US and Japan. It is also developing a Terminal High-Altitude Area Defense missile to intercept all but long-range missiles.

However, most of the funding has been funnelled into missile defence systems that would target incoming missiles in mid-course – the longest phase of flight. A ground-based system, which has already been deployed in California and Alaska and may be set up in Poland and the Czech Republic, is the core part of layered defence.

Critics attack the programme on various fronts, including effectiveness, cost – the Pentagon has asked Congress for about $11bn in funding for missile defence in the 2008 fiscal year – and the possibility that it could cause an arms race. Some observe that the systems under development are no defence against short-range rockets, of the sort Hizbollah fired into Israel from Lebanon last year, and cannot cope with cruise missiles, which have proliferated. Another criticism is that the Pentagon should not spend time and resources deploying the system until it has completed much more testing.

While Gen Obering uses the example of Hizbollah's rocket campaign to underscore the need for preparedness, critics point to the inability of the US and Israel to target these very short-range missiles as evidence that decades of development have come up short.

"Despite the many tens of billions of dollars spent on missile defence and the flagrantly inaccurate claims by proponents of missile defence systems, after 50 years missile defence remains an experimental system that has provided the US with very few tangible results," retired Lieutenant General Robert Gard and John Issacs of the Center for Arms Control on Non-Proliferation wrote last year.

DOJ_NMG_0141608

During his recent public campaign to boost support for missile defence, Gen Obering has attempted to win over sceptics by pointing out that 14 of the last 15 tests were successful. “There is a misconception out there that missile defence doesn’t work and I’m here to say it does work,” he recently told an audience in Washington.

But Ian Davis, co-executive director of the British American Security Information Council, says Gen Obering is conflating the results of tests of different parts of the system, which masks the record of ground-based missile defence, the most important part of the layered system. “GMD...has made intercepts in only six of the 11 attempts,” says Mr Davis. “Furthermore, these intercepts were done under highly scripted circumstances that in no way reflect a real-life situation.”

Similar warnings have been raised by Pentagon officials with responsibility for evaluating the missile defence testing. Last February, David Duma, then Pentagon director of operational testing and evaluation, told Congress that there was “insufficient evidence to support a confident assessment of limited defensive operations”.

Gen Obering says a test last September – the first successful interception in four years – has changed the equation. The Pentagon fired an interceptor from California, which destroyed a missile launched from Alaska in simulation of an attack from North Korea.

Phil Coyle, a former director of operational testing and evaluation during the Clinton administration, dismisses claims by Gen Obering that the test was as realistic as possible – pointing out that the incoming missile did not use decoys or other counter-measures.

“If an enemy uses decoys and counter-measures, missile defence is like trying to shoot a hole-in-one in golf when the hole is going 15,000mph and the green is covered with black circles the same size as the hole,” says Mr Coyle. “The golfer can’t determine which target to aim for.”

Gen Obering says the September test did not use counter-measures because it was intended to ensure that previous problems where interceptors failed to launch had been corrected. Earlier tests dealt fine with decoys, he adds. The next test is expected in May but the MDA has yet to determine parameters. Gen Obering is not swayed. “Just because I cannot handle very, very complex counter-measures, does that mean that I should not deploy a system that can deploy simple ones?”

Moscow's Missile Defense Bluster (WSJ)

By Marshall Billingslea

The Wall Street Journal, March 7, 2007

Russian reactions to the discussions among Poland, the Czech Republic and the United States on a missile defense system in Europe have been disconcerting. Some of the rhetoric in past days -- such as Monday's blunt threats by Lt. Gen. Igor Khvorov to target European missile defense sites with bombers, or intimations by other Russian officials of scrapping the 1987 INF Treaty (which bans short- and medium-range nuclear missiles) -- is a throwback to a bygone era that needs to stay gone.

Moscow should be well aware that the proposed defense installations are focused on the emerging Iranian threat. Russian defense planners surely understand the physics and geography of the potential deployment, and know that a Czech radar facing south and 10 interceptors in Poland pose no threat to the credibility of the Russian deterrent of thousands of warheads. It would be physically impossible for interceptors in Poland to chase down Russian ICBMs headed toward North America. The Russian ICBMs move too fast, and defensive interceptors cannot win such a "tail chase."

Nor could they get out of their silos fast enough to protect Europe from a Russian missile attack, even if the radar were facing in that direction, which it wouldn't be. The radar would not be able to see incoming Russian missiles in time, and -- again -- the interceptors would be thrown into a losing tail chase. In other words, the system proposed for Poland and the Czech Republic is clearly designed to protect against Iran, and not against Russia. No doubt about it.

Unlike the NATO nations, who are in the early stages of developing missile defenses, Russia has long possessed its own antiballistic missile defense for its capital, making recent Russian protests even more perplexing. What's more, the Kremlin has been deeply engaged in theater missile defense cooperation with NATO.

The NATO alliance and Russia have done complex modeling and simulations, improving one another's understanding of how to defend against short-range missiles. Through the NATO-Russia Council, they have conducted multiple joint exercises and developed the command-and-control mechanisms needed to jointly defend territory from attack -- Russian troops working alongside NATO forces. Moreover, NATO has consistently held open the option for deeper Russian involvement in missile defense work. Recent rhetoric aside, this is not an adversarial relationship; it has been a highly positive, friendly one.

For these reasons, one would think that the missile defense system being discussed by the Czech Republic, Poland and the U.S. would be uncontroversial and widely applauded, including by Russia. Iran's nuclear ambitions and defiance of the United Nations Security Council (of which Russia is a permanent member), combined with its aggressive missile-testing program and plans for a "satellite launch" with a multi-ton rocket, would seem to be compelling reasons for multinational cooperation on such a protection.

DOJ_NMG_0141609

Recall that Iran already has a small number of ballistic missiles capable of hitting some NATO members, and that it clearly wants the ability to target all of Europe and North America. Together with its crash nuclear program, Iran's missile ambitions are worrisome enough. But Tehran's aggressive behavior is a source of even greater concern.

This past summer, the terrorist group Hezbollah began firing barrages of Iranian-supplied missiles at Israeli cities. Now there is overwhelming evidence that Iran is supplying terrorists in Iraq with advanced weapons; the proof ranges from seizure of sophisticated Iranian-produced explosives in insurgent stockpiles to the actual capture of Iranian operatives.

We face today a volatile mix: President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and his hostility toward Israel and the West; material support by elements of the Iranian military to terrorist groups; and spinning nuclear centrifuges and missile tests. What better set of reasons is there for friendly nations to work closely together on building effective defenses for their populations?

The beauty of the system under discussion for Europe lies in its planned capabilities, its small footprint and the speed with which it could be deployed. The technology involved has been proven and tested. In fact, the U.S. has already deployed such a system against North Korea. The same basic approach -- building a radar, deploying a handful of interceptors and linking the system to a communications network that includes several other NATO allies -- will provide a defense of Europe and enhanced protection of North America against long-range missile attacks from the Middle East.

A second advantage is that a missile shield over Europe would further preserve and strengthen Alliance solidarity in the face of real and growing threats. As NATO's secretary general, Jaap de Hoop Scheffer, has repeatedly pointed out, the security of the alliance should be "indivisible." It is a good thing that some allies, such as the U.S., already have a missile shield. But should not all NATO partners be afforded such protection?

While NATO has invested a great deal of time and effort developing an overall plan for protecting the European continent from all types of missile attack, so far it has chosen to focus only on the shorter-range threats. At the recent summit in Riga, Latvia, NATO signed its first contract for a robust, mobile defense against shorter-range missiles (such as the ones Iran already has in its inventory). The broader Czech-Polish-U.S. initiative, while not a NATO program per se, will nevertheless fill the remaining capability gap against longer-range threats. When integrated with the NATO missile defense programs, this will provide a truly "layered" defense of Europe.

Rather than squaring off over the issue of missile defense, policy makers should take a hard look at the real security threat: the behavior of rogue regimes such as Iran and North Korea. In the case of Iran, Russia could choose to play a decisive role by terminating the flow of technology into worrisome nuclear programs and continuing to signal resolve through the U.N. Security Council.

All nations have an inherent right to defend themselves. Indeed, it is an obligation for democratic governments. With Russian help, we could ensure that missile defense is not the last and only line of defense against Iran.

Mr. Billingslea is a former assistant secretary general of NATO and former chairman of the NATO-Russia Council's ad hoc working group on theater missile defense.

U.S. Doctor And Daughter Sickened By Poison In Russia (NYT)

By C. J. Chivers

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

MOSCOW, March 6 — An American doctor and her daughter were being treated in a Moscow hospital on Tuesday after showing signs of thallium poisoning. Thallium is a highly toxic element with a history of use in pesticides and in murder.

Both women, who emigrated from the Soviet Union in the 1980s but recently returned to Russia for a vacation, were severely sickened but their lives are not in danger, medical officials here said.

“They have positive dynamics, and their condition is improving,” said Dr. Viktor M. Kaznacheyev, the chief physician at the Sklifosovsky Clinic here, said in a telephone interview. The women have been treated at the clinic since falling ill on Feb. 24.

Dr. Kaznacheyev said the victims, Dr. Marina Kovalevsky, 49, and her daughter, Yana, 26, of Studio City, Calif., were under the supervision of poison specialists. “They were in a serious condition when they were delivered here,” he added.

Citing privacy concerns, he declined to discuss further details beyond saying that their symptoms were consistent with thallium poisoning.

Dr. Kovalevsky is an internal medicine specialist in private practice in West Hollywood, Calif., and has had admitting privileges at the Cedars-Sinai Medical Center since 1999, a spokeswoman for the hospital said. She was educated in the 1970s in Kemerovo, an industrial and coal-mining region in southern Siberia.

She returned to Russia on Feb. 14 for a vacation and was due back at her office to see patients on Feb. 26, Dr. Arkady Stern, a colleague covering for her at her practice on Santa Monica Boulevard, said by telephone.

The circumstances of the poisonings are unclear, but it appears that Dr. Kovalevsky and her daughter ingested the poison while in Moscow. “She left Los Angeles in perfectly good health,” Dr. Stern said.

DOJ_NMG_0141610

The mystery of the poisonings, after the fatal poisoning in London last year of Alexander V. Litvinenko, a former K.G.B. officer and outspoken critic of the Kremlin, attracted immediate attention and speculation in the Russian news media.

Mr. Litvinenko's initial diagnosis was thallium poisoning, but his doctors later determined that he had ingested radioactive polonium. Before dying, he publicly accused President Vladimir V. Putin of having had a hand in the poisoning. The killing remains unsolved.

Thallium, an element with no taste or odor, has been used as an ingredient in insecticides and rat poison, and as well by criminals and intelligence services, including those of the Soviet Union and of Iraq under Saddam Hussein.

Published reports have said that the Central Intelligence Agency chose thallium as a poison to be sprinkled in Fidel Castro's shoes — a plot that was never carried out.

When ingested, thallium is a slow-acting poison that can cause excruciating abdominal pain, breathing difficulties, damage to the nervous system and extensive hair loss.

Dr. Stern said the two women had been administered Prussian blue, an antidote commonly used to counteract thallium's effect, and had undergone dialysis to help rid their systems of lingering toxins.

He said that the women had been cleared to travel from Moscow and that they hoped to return to the United States by the end of the week and receive further treatment there.

There is no indication that either woman would have been of interest to Russian intelligence services, and no clear criminal motive for the poisoning.

"My personal opinion," Dr. Stern said, "is that it could be some mistake. I cannot imagine that anyone in their right mind would want to hurt this person. She is very loved and very respected by her patients, her colleagues and her friends."

The authorities in Moscow said they were trying to determine whom the women had seen since they arrived. The police are retracing the routes of the women in Moscow to try to detect traces of thallium in any places they visited, according to the official Interfax news agency.

Peace Force Is Attacked On Arrival In Somalia (NYT)

By Jeffrey Gettleman

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

KINDU, Congo, March 6 — The first group of African Union peacekeepers arrived Tuesday in Mogadishu, Somalia's capital, and received a patently Mogadishu reception.

Insurgents shelled the airport where peacekeepers from Uganda had landed and peppered the area with gunfire, witnesses said, setting off battles across the city that killed several civilians.

The episode was the latest burst of violence in Somalia, and a sign that the situation the new peacekeepers are stepping into is dangerously reminiscent of the chaos that haunted the last such mission to Somalia in the 1990s. After 18 American soldiers were killed in the infamous "Black Hawk Down" episode in 1993, most troops were withdrawn.

The Ugandan peacekeepers are the vanguard of an African Union force that is intended to expand to 8,000 soldiers, though only 4,000 have been committed, mostly from nations that are close American allies, like Nigeria and Ghana.

The United States government paid to fly the Ugandans, around 400 soldiers and several armored trucks, to Somalia, and American diplomats continue to coax other African nations to contribute troops.

United States military officers have also been working closely with officials from Ethiopia, which in December helped to oust an Islamist movement that controlled much of Somalia. The Ethiopian troops paved the way for Somalia's transitional government to seize control of the capital, but maintaining order has proved elusive.

Each day the insurgent attacks seem to intensify. On Tuesday, dozens of masked gunmen blasted an Ethiopian Army base in a coordinated attack that engulfed several of the more densely packed neighborhoods of Mogadishu.

Residents said Ethiopian troops pursuing the insurgents ordered families out of their homes at gunpoint.

"But we're not going to leave, especially not for any Ethiopians," said Kadijah Warsaame, a resident of a Mogadishu neighborhood called the Black Sea.

Many people suspect that the insurgents are remnants of the ousted Islamist movement, which won wide popular support last year when it pacified Mogadishu for the first time since Somalia's central government collapsed in 1991. Many of Mogadishu's influential clans backed the Islamists and have been lukewarm toward the transitional government, which is controlled by a clan from north of Mogadishu and includes many former warlords.

On Tuesday, elders of the powerful Hawiye clan issued a long statement condemning the Ethiopian occupation and accusing government troops of killing civilians.

DOJ_NMG_0141611

The statement also said: "To disarm the armed people in Somalia, the government must come up with a clear policy that all Somalis find fair and just. We will not accept that some particular tribes be disarmed and made to hand over the confiscated arms to other tribes."

The Other Somalia: An Island Of Stability In A Sea Of Armed Chaos (NYT)

By Jeffrey Gettleman

The New York Times, March 7, 2007

HARGEYSA, Somalia, March 1 — When the sun rises over the craggy hills of Hargeysa, it sheds light on a different kind of Somalia.

Ice cream trucks selling bona fide soft serve hit the streets. Money changers, unarmed and unguarded, push cash through the market in wheelbarrows. Politicians from three distinct parties get ready for another day of debate, which recently included an animated discussion on registering nomadic voters.

It's all part of a Somali puzzle: how one area of the country, the northwest, also known as Somaliland, can seem so peaceful and functional — so normal, in fact — while the rest continues to be such a violent, chaotic mess.

This tale of two Somalias is especially striking now, as thousands of African Union peacekeepers prepare to rescue Mogadishu, the nation's bloodstained capital, from itself. The internationally backed transitional government that seized Mogadishu in late December with Ethiopia's help says it cannot survive without foreign aid and foreign peacekeepers to quell clan fighting and an escalating insurgency.

Somalilanders, who have wrestled with their own clan conflicts, find this ridiculous.

"You can't be donated power," said Dahir Rayale Kahin, the president of the Republic of Somaliland, which has long declared itself independent from the rest of Somalia. "We built this state because we saw the problems here as our problems. Our brothers in the south are still waiting — till now — for others."

But Somalilanders are waiting, too: waiting to be recognized. In 1991, as Somalia's government disintegrated and clan fighting in the south spun out of control, Somaliland, traditionally one of the poorest parts of Somalia, claimed its independence. But no country acknowledges it as a separate state and very few even contribute aid — which makes Somaliland's success all the more intriguing.

Its leaders, with no Western experts at their elbow, have devised a political system that minimizes clan rivalries while carving out a special role for clan elders, the traditional pillars of Somali society. They have demobilized thousands of the young gunmen who still plague Somalia and melded them into a national army. They have even held three rounds of multiparty elections, no small feat in a region, the Horn of Africa, where multiparty democracy is mostly a rumor. Somalia, for one, has not had free elections since the 1960s.

Of course, Somaliland has not always been so stable, and Somalia has not always been so chaotic. Even now, critics say the Somaliland government can be repressive and inefficient, and the mental hospital in Hargeysa, the capital of Somaliland, seems to be evidence of both — patients are chained to their beds in dark, smelly rooms.

But Somalilanders are quick to point out that at least they have a mental hospital, which the more populous south does not. And their steady, underdog efforts to create a functioning state from the ruins of war seems to dispel the notion that Somalia is an inherently ungovernable, warlike place.

So, what happened?

"It all goes back to the Brits," according to Hajji Abdi Waraabe, an 89-year-old member of Somaliland's upper house of Parliament.

When the colonial powers sliced up the Horn of Africa in the 19th century, the British got Somaliland and the Italians got Somalia. While the British relied mostly on clan chiefs to govern, the Italians created an entire Italian-speaking administration and imported thousands of people from Italy to farm bananas, build cathedrals and teach the people how to pour espresso.

One result was that Mogadishu, along the southern coast, became a major commercial hub and one of the most beautiful cities in Africa, but its traditional systems of authority were weakened. That is partly why, many Somalia analysts say, warlords were able to outmuscle clan elders and dominate Mogadishu in the vacuum that formed after the central government fell.

The British, on the other hand, never invested much in Somaliland, leaving it poor and dusty but with its traditions more or less intact. The two territories were granted independence in 1960 and quickly merged to form the Somali Republic, but it was never a happy marriage. By the 1980s, the Somali National Movement, a northern rebel group, was blowing up government posts.

In 1988, government fighter bombers, at the orders of President Mohamed Siad Barre, flattened Hargeysa, killing 50,000 civilians.

DOJ_NMG_0141612

The Somali National Movement proved indispensable in the fragile years after the Barre government collapsed. It set up the guurti, a council of wise men from every clan, which soon evolved into an official decision-making body.

Most of the men were illiterate herders but they became the glue that held Somaliland together. In a sparsely populated nomadic society, where many people live far from government services, clan elders are traditionally the ones to reconcile differences and maintain social order.

"They were a cushion," said Ahmed Mohammed Silanyo, the leader of Somaliland's main opposition party. "Whenever there was friction, these old men would step in and say, 'What's wrong with you boys? Stay together.' "

In the 1990s, while clan warlords in Mogadishu were leveling the city's fine Italian architecture, the guurti, along with rebel leaders, were building a government.

Somaliland, like Somalia, was awash with weapons and split by warring clans. Their first step was persuading the militiamen to give up their guns — a goal that still seems remote in the south. They moved slowly, first taking the armed pickups, then the heavy guns and ultimately leaving light weapons in the hands of the people. Again, this stood in contrast to the south, where in the early 1990s thousands of American marines and United Nations peacekeepers failed to put a dent in the clan violence.

"We had a higher purpose," said Abdillahi M. Duale, Somaliland's foreign minister. "Independence. And nobody in the outside world was going to help us get there."

That would prove to be a theme here. The less outside help, the better. Over the years southern Somalia has received tens of millions — if not hundreds of millions — of dollars in aid, and Somaliland almost nothing. The difference is striking, though it is true that Somaliland may be easier to govern with an estimated 2.5 million people, compared with 6 million in the south, and a somewhat less complex clan structure.

Still, for elections in 2002, Somaliland leaders devised a system specifically to check clan power. They limited the number of political parties to three to prevent a repeat of the fragmentation of the 1960s, when nationwide elections spawned more than 60 political parties, essentially one for each subclan. It was an attempt to create parties based on ideology, not tribe, something that has proved very difficult across Africa.

The leaders also turned the guurti, whose 82 elders are appointed by their respective clans, into the upper house of Parliament, "Somaliland's senators," as people here like to say.

In some ways, Somalia's transitional government is now trying to replicate Somaliland's approach by including representatives of all the major clans.

But some experts say the transitional government is missing broad support, partly because Somalia lacks the same strong clan leadership as Somaliland and because many of those selected to serve in the transitional government lack the stature of guurti elders.

The guurti in Somaliland can strike down laws passed by the elected House of Representatives, though the representatives can override the guurti with a two-thirds vote. It is a mix of tradition and modernity, Western-style democracy meets Somali-style politics, though some people feel it is time to renovate the system.

"We need to move on," said Faisal Ali Waraabe, leader of the opposition Justice and Welfare Party. "The guurti helped get us through a crisis, but now we're trying to push our people from tribal loyalty to institutional loyalty, from clan loyalty to national loyalty."

Mr. Silanyo agrees. "It's ridiculous to have an elected body that can be trumped by an unelected body," he said.

For all its progress in clan reconciliation, Somaliland still has its blood feuds. Just this week, a task force of eight guurti members convoyed from Hargeysa to the seaside town of Berbera to work out a truce between two clans fighting over pasture land. Already, four people have been shot.

But the one issue that unites most Somalilanders is recognition. Somaliland has its own money, its own flag, its own national anthem and even its own passport.

"And we have peace, a peace owned by the community," said Zamzam Adan, a women's rights activist. "You'd think in this part of the world, that would count for something."

U.S. Prepares For Thousands To Flee Cuba (WT)

By Carmen Gentile

The Washington Times, March 7, 2007

MIAMI -- Fearing a potential mass exodus of Cubans when Fidel Castro dies, dozens of federal, state and local agencies, along with the military, will participate in a massive two-day training exercise beginning today to hone migrant-interdiction skills.

The exercise will also test readiness to intercept vessels heading to Cuba. Some Cuban exile groups in South Florida have made clear their desire to set sail for Havana once they receive proof of Mr. Castro's demise.

DOJ_NMG_0141613

Last week, 47 migrants from Cuba were intercepted at sea by the Coast Guard and sent back to the communist island. One of those intercepted was allowed to stay because of a medical condition that required immediate attention.

The 50 or more groups participating in Operation Vigilant Sentry -- a Coast Guard-designed drill -- will also involve representatives from the State Department, the Pentagon and the Justice and Homeland Security departments.

Though Coast Guard officials would not specify just how many ships, aircraft and people would participate, they did acknowledge it as the most extensive preparation yet for such a mass-migration scenario.

"By interdicting people at sea, it's putting out the message that it's not safe to travel here that way," said Coast Guard Petty Officer Jennifer Johnson.

One scenario to be practiced during the exercise is the interception of a vessel sailing out of Fort Lauderdale, Fla. for Cuba.

"We're going to simulate several situations to test areas of the plan to see if they are working," said another Coast Guard official.

The ailing Mr. Castro, 80, ceded power in July to his younger brother, Raul. The elder Mr. Castro had abdominal surgery and has not been seen in public since.

This week's exercise comes weeks after Congress approved an $18 million Pentagon plan to prepare U.S. Naval Base Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to accommodate migrants intercepted at sea.

Bush administration officials told The Washington Times the improvements would create facilities to handle about 10,000 migrants.

Other improvements would include a processing center for those seeking asylum.

Typically, Cubans who reach dry land in the United States are allowed to remain in the country, while those intercepted at sea are returned home.

Officials fear the so-called "wet foot-dry foot" policy would be overwhelmed in the event of a mass migration.

"The capacity to process migrants at Guantanamo is an integral part of our plans to ensure that any attempted mass migration in the Caribbean is not successful," one Bush administration official said.

A new detainment center and stepped-up vigilance along the waters separating Florida and Cuba won't deter thousands from attempting to gain access to the United States after Mr. Castro's death, said Andy Gomez, a senior fellow at the University of Miami's Institute for Cuban and Cuban-American Studies.

Mr. Gomez said he has warned Bush administration officials that up to 500,000 Cubans could flee the island "in all directions," inundating not just the United States, but several Caribbean and Central American nations with asylum seekers.

"We [in South Florida] are very concerned whether we can absorb that kind of migration -- we just don't have that kind of infrastructure," he said, noting likely shortfalls in housing, health care and public services were hundreds of thousands of migrants to arrive on Florida's shores.

Kosovo's Road To Independence (WSJ)

By Morton Abramowitz

The Wall Street Journal, March 7, 2007

PRISTINA, Kosovo -- Kosovo, still trying to emerge from Belgrade's long and difficult rule and more recently from international control, has a long way to go to establish a viable, stable state. But its slow, halting progress is being impeded by its former Serb masters, backed in the United Nations by Russia.

Once the poorest and mostly forgotten part of the former Yugoslavia, Kosovo still suffers from massive unemployment, weak political institutions, and much corruption. But it is an increasingly vital place, and its energetic people are looking for a new burst of activity when independence finally arrives.

Meanwhile, Serbia's glory has dimmed. It could become a dynamic state, as evidenced by recent market reforms and an uptick in economic activity. But it is no longer a political leader or the hub of the Western Balkans, and it is unlikely to resume its former prominence. For some 15 years its people have endured Slobodan Milosevic, war, international isolation, declining living standards and Belgrade's mismanagement. And if its leaders persist in fighting to the end to hold Kosovo -- and even after defeat to try to undermine an independent Kosovo -- that will not change much. Kosovo independence is very much about Serbia's future.

Persistence seems to be the order of the day in Belgrade. The Serb political class, led by Prime Minister Vojislav Kostunica, is risking the future of their country in a desperate attempt to hold on to a territory they do not control, for a people who want no part of Serbia, and whom Serbia does not want as part of its polity. Indeed Kosovo has already been severed from Serbia.

DOJ_NMG_0141614

Mr. Kostunica has spent the past year doing his best to belittle the U.N. secretary-general's special envoy for a Kosovo settlement, former Finnish President Martti Ahtisaari, and to resolutely oppose his proposal for the final status of the territory. That proposal provides for what is commonly called "supervised independence," heavy protection for an understandably frightened Serb population and Orthodox religious sites, and an EU mission with significant power over the new state.

Mr. Kostunica also spent the year trying to delay movement on Mr. Ahtisaari's proposal, hopeful that delay would enable him to generate support for Serbian sovereignty in a wavering Europe and perhaps spark violent behavior from the Kosovo Albanians. In pursuing delay, Mr. Kostunica crafted and won (in a much questioned referendum last October) a new constitution whose preamble proclaims Kosovo an inalienable part of Serbia. He recently threatened dire if unspecified action against any state recognizing Kosovo's independence. And now there is even much talk in Belgrade of partitioning Kosovo, which the West has resolutely opposed.

Mr. Ahtisaari is expected make his recommendations for Kosovo's final status this week, which the U.N. Security Council will take up later this month. The U.S. and EU countries will accept them and support repeal of its resolution 1244 of 1999, that provides for Serbia's sovereignty over Kosovo. This will in effect endorse Kosovo's path to declaring independence. Mr. Kostunica is pinning his hopes on Russia vetoing any such action, thus leaving 1244 intact.

Moscow presently asserts that both parties must agree to any Kosovo settlement, in effect endorsing continued Serbian sovereignty over Kosovo. Russia, which has contributed little to the Balkans the past 20 years, is threatening to upend the settlement long sought by the West, which has invested enormous resources to bring a measure of stability to the area.

Whether in the end Russia vetoes a new U.N. resolution remains to be seen. Much depends on the determination of the West to proceed. If the West can not get the Russians to at least abstain on a new resolution, an essentially regional issue becomes a far messier problem with wider geopolitical concerns. In that event the U.S. and EU countries will have to find the fortitude to recognize Kosovo's independence without the stamp of legitimacy of a new U.N. resolution.

The Security Council faces a dilemma. Breaking up a country is a rare event. A number of countries want a legal basis for Kosovo independence, and may prove unwilling to recognize an independent Kosovo without one. But many countries also realize that Serbia has lost Kosovo, and that Kosovo independence is essential to reduce uncertainty in the Balkans and remove a major cause of instability. Moreover, the chance of both Serbia and Kosovo to prosper and be integrated into the EU requires a resolution of Kosovo's status.

Nor does independence necessarily end the Kosovo problem. Kosovo is not Montenegro, whose separation from Serbia was also fiercely resisted by Mr. Kostunica. Many Serbs have a deep emotional attachment to Kosovo which is easy for foreigners to discount. Serbia's leaders have to decide whether they want to accept the verdict of the West, to cooperate in shaping a new Balkans, including an independent Kosovo, and to pursue seriously membership in the EU. Or do they search for every means to destabilize the new Kosovo and their neighborhood? The answer is not apparent. Serbia's progress lies in its leaders' hands.

Mr. Abramowitz, a former U.S. ambassador to Turkey, is a senior fellow at the Century Foundation.

After The Rock, Diplomacy (WP)

By David Ignatius

The Washington Post, March 7, 2007

A caustic former U.S. ambassador named Chas Freeman compiled a volume he called "The Diplomat's Dictionary." It included several memorable definitions, including "Diplomacy is the art of saying 'nice doggie' till you can find a rock," and "Diplomacy is letting someone else have your way."

The Bush administration, which has generally favored the "find a rock" strategy, seems to be bending toward the subtler "have your way" approach. This conversion is long overdue. But it will require the administration to do what it has sometimes found hardest, which is to prioritize its foreign policy goals and go all-out on the ones it decides are most important.

The clearest example of the administration's new outreach is its turnabout on discussions with Iran and Syria about how to stabilize Iraq. A year ago, the Iranians (responding to what they thought was an American overture) announced that they were ready for such talks -- whereupon the administration pulled back. That was a mistake that made the Iraq mess even worse.

Now, Bush is altering course slightly, with last week's announcement that the United States will join a regional conference in Baghdad. But the administration shouldn't go into these talks holding its nose. If the administration is serious, it should use the initial meeting to set up regular U.S.-Iranian discussions about Iraq. The administration should also start a real dialogue with Syria -- and in the process shelve any half-baked ideas about regime change that may be lurking in the Eisenhower Executive Office Building. The Syrians pose a deadly threat in Lebanon, which is all the more reason to be talking with them. The obvious person to begin this conversation is James A. Baker III, who knows the Syrians well from his days as secretary of state.

DOJ_NMG_0141615

Speaking of Baker, the administration seems to be tacking back toward the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group, which Bush appeared to dismiss back in December. Bush's top aides have concluded that they made a mistake in seeming to reject the Baker-Hamilton report and announcing their troop surge a month later as if it were an alternative. In the process, they set back hopes for a bipartisan policy on Iraq -- something officials now regret.

One senior administration official explained: "We think our Iraq strategy is consistent with Baker-Hamilton. We want to get to the same place, but not on the same timeline. Baker-Hamilton said our strategy is underpowered in terms of diplomacy. What we're saying today is: We heard you. We are picking up the pace on regional and international diplomacy." I can't buy the claim that the administration has supported Baker-Hamilton all along, but this is certainly a welcome change of tone.

Making hard diplomatic choices will be especially necessary if the administration is serious about brokering peace between Israel and the Palestinians. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice sometimes acts as if she can merely dangle a toe in this whirlpool, but to make progress she will have to jump in. And as a mediator, she is bound to make some Israelis and Palestinians angry.

The final areas in which the administration is rediscovering diplomacy are its dealings with China and Russia. Bush played the China card effectively in the six-party talks with North Korea, and the administration sensibly decided to cut an imperfect deal with Pyongyang, even if it brought brickbats from the right wing.

The Russia diplomacy may prove the most delicate of all. Russian President Vladimir Putin is the essential ally in U.S. efforts to stop the Iranian nuclear program, but Putin made clear in a speech in Munich last month that there will be a price for Russia's help. After the speech, Bush's national security adviser, Stephen Hadley, traveled to Moscow to visit Putin in what one official describes as a "meeting of mutual respect and dialogue." A senior official explains the Russian message this way: "We want to be your partner. We have common interests. You have to treat us with respect -- talk to us early and take us into account."

After a slow start, the Russians are indeed becoming a reliable partner on Iran. They informed State Department officials this week that they will support a quick new U.N. Security Council resolution condemning Iran. And they have even voiced a willingness to halt work on the nuclear reactor they're building for the Iranians at Bushehr.

And what will we offer the Russians, in return for their cooperation on Iran? Well, that's the art of diplomacy.

DOJ_NMG_0141616

Miller, Charles S

From: Miller, Charles S
Sent: Wednesday, March 07, 2007 11:24 AM
To: Ablin, Erik; Agarwal, Asheesh (CRT); Ames, Andrew; Battaglia, John T; Baxter, Felix (CIV); Beckner, Rick (CIV); Blomquist, Kathleen M; Branda, Joyce (CIV); Bucholtz, Jeffrey (CIV); Bukvics, Jennifer (CIV); Claterbos, Barbara (CIV); Cohen, David M.; Cohn, Jonathan (CIV); Davidson, Jeanne (CIV); Davis, Dan (CIV); Davis, Deborah J; Dupree, Thomas (CIV); Fargo, John (CIV); Fielding, Gabrielle (CIV); Fischer, Gerard (CIV); Flentje, August (CIV); Frost, Peter (CIV); Garren, Timothy (CIV); Glynn, J.Patrick (CIV); Gorsuch, Neil M; Gunn, Currie (SMO); Hertz, Michael (CIV); Hollis, Robert (CIV); Hunt, Jody (CIV); Hussey, Thom (CIV); Jeweler, James (CIV); Katsas, Gregory; Keisler, Peter D (CIV); Kohn, Chris (CIV); Kopp, Robert (CIV); Letter, Douglas (CIV); Levine, Larry (EOIR); Lindemann, Michael (CIV); Magnuson, Cynthia; McCallum, Robert (SMO); McDonald, Esther Slater; McMahon, Linda M (CIV); Miller, Charles S; Nichols, Carl (CIV); Nowacki, John (USAEO); O'Quinn, John C; Osborn, Tara (CIV); Pyles, Phyllis (CIV); Rivera, Jennifer (CIV); Roehrkasse, Brian; Schiffer, Stuart; Schiffer, Stuart (CIV); Scolinos, Tasia; Seidel, Rebecca; Shaw, Aloma A; Spellberg, Dianne (CIV); Swenson, Lily F; Thirolf, Eugene; Wilson, Karen L; Zwick, Ken (CIV)
Subject: 3/7/07 Civil Division News

ACLU sues U.S. government on behalf of Canadian boy held in Texas; Group seeks family's immediate release

Air Force must pay for Lowry cleanup; U.S. judge rules for home builders in asbestos lawsuit

$7B proposed over Indian trusts suit

Hicks' new U.S. court challenge

Globe and Mail

March 7, 2007

ACLU sues U.S. government on behalf of Canadian boy held in Texas; Group seeks family's immediate release

UNNATI GANDHI - With a report from Karen Howlett

A nine-year-old Canadian boy being held at an immigration detention centre in Texas with his Iranian parents is now involved in a civil lawsuit seeking his release.

The American Civil Liberties Union yesterday filed papers against the secretary of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security and six officials from U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, on behalf of 10 children being held at the T. Don Hutto Family Detention Center in Taylor, Tex.

Canadian-born Kevin Yourdkhani and his parents, Majid Yourdkhani and Masomeh Alibegi, were detained last month after their flight to Toronto made an unscheduled stop on U.S. soil and they were found to be carrying fake passports. They were attempting to return to Canada after being deported to Iran in December, 2005, when their 10-year quest for asylum here failed. Their last names became public record when the lawsuit was filed.

The civil liberties union says the ICE does not meet minimum conditions for housing minors, and many children lack access to adequate medical care and education opportunities.

?Those standards established that children should be released promptly, and if they have to remain in detention, that they are placed in the least restrictive setting available, where they're guaranteed basic educational, health and social benefits,? said Lisa Graybill, legal director of the ACLU of Texas.

?I don't think the Hutto facility has been compliant with any one of those standards.?

The lawsuit asks the government to release the 10 children and their families.

Meanwhile, a formal application for a temporary residency permit for Mr. Yourdkhani and Ms. Alibegi, who have no legal status in Canada, was filed on Monday with Canadian immigration authorities, said Andrew Brouwer, the family's Toronto-based lawyer.

Along with the application, Mr. Brouwer sent Minister of Citizenship and Immigration Diane Finley a letter written by Amnesty International that assesses the risk the family faces if it is returned to Iran.

?As individuals who have claimed that they were detained and tortured by the Iranian authorities; fled Iran by illegally crossing the border into Turkey; obtained fraudulent documents to travel to Canada and whose case has been widely publicized in the media, Amnesty International believes that [they] are at serious risk of grave human rights abuses including detention and torture in Iran, and as such they should not be forcibly removed to that country,? wrote Gloria Nafziger, co-ordinator at Amnesty International.

Mr. Brouwer said immigration authorities began reviewing the family's temporary residency application as early as Monday night.

?If they wanted to, it could be decided by the end of today. They can either decide to grant temporary residence to Majid and Masomeh, or not.?

Prime Minister Stephen Harper told reporters yesterday that whenever Canadians are incarcerated abroad, the federal government contacts consular officials to provide assistance.

END

Denver Rocky Mountain News (CO)

March 7, 2007

Air Force must pay for Lowry cleanup; U.S. judge rules for home builders in asbestos lawsuit

James Paton, Rocky Mountain News

The Air Force is responsible for asbestos cleanup costs borne by home builders at the former Lowry base, according to a court ruling that could have expensive implications for the government.

Richmond American Homes and other companies sued the Air Force after discovering asbestos in the soil and failing to persuade the U.S . government to pay the bill.

The expense totaled about $9 million, parts of which covered construction delays and compensation for homeowners, the builders' lawyers said.

"This case has national importance" because of a decision to close 22 major military bases by 2011, said Michelle Kales, an attorney with Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck in Denver.

The ruling late last month by a U.S. Court of Federal Claims judge probably will get the attention of real estate developers, home builders and lenders, the lawyers said. It "provides assurance they won't have to bear the potentially significant cost of environmental contamination," Kales said.

Air Force lawyers could not be reached for comment.

While the home builders put the cost at $9 million, the damages have not been determined by the court.

The home builders, a group that also includes Metropolitan Development, Standard Pacific of Colorado and Touchstone Homes, purchased the property in 2001 and 2002 from the Lowry Redevelopment Authority, a quasi-public entity overseeing the base's conversion from military to civilian use.

After the asbestos was found, the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment in 2003 temporarily halted construction at part of the site. When the Air Force did not clean up the asbestos, the companies had to undertake the effort themselves, their lawyers said.

The Lowry Redevelopment Authority filed a similar lawsuit against the Air Force a year ago and said it was heartened by the ruling in the home builders' case. Its lawsuit still is pending.

"It is critical for the insurance, finance and development industries to have strong confidence in these projects in order for them to be successfully redeveloped," Tom Markham, the group's executive director, said in a statement. "Essential to that is the Defense Department's acknowledgement of its responsibilities to pay for cleaning up hazardous materials such as asbestos."

The LRA noted it's likely the Air Force will appeal the decision.

END

AFX

March 7, 2007

$7B proposed over Indian trusts suit

WASHINGTON (AP) - The U.S. government has proposed paying $7 billion to settle lawsuits over the management of Indian trust lands -- an offer met with immediate objections from Indian plaintiffs.

At issue is a decade-old lawsuit by Indians against the government claiming that the government has mismanaged more than $100 billion in oil, gas, timber and other royalties held in trust from their lands dating back to 1887.

The litigation, filed in 1996 by Blackfeet Indian Elouise Cobell, deals with individual Indians' lands. Several tribes have also sued, claiming mismanagement of their lands.

Senate Indian Affairs Committee Chairman Byron Dorgan, D-N.D., said he will hold hearings on the proposal and said the settlement offer is the first time the federal government has acknowledged a multibillion dollar liability for mismanagement of the trust funds over the past century.

'That is a significant admission,' Dorgan said, adding that he believes the conditions attached to the settlement offer will be controversial.

Cobell\l "l" and one of her attorneys, Keith Harper, said the Interior Department is asking for too much.

Under the terms of the offer, the government would pay $7 billion over ten years, without interest. In exchange for the money, all tribal and individual mismanagement claims against the government would be dropped and the government would be relieved of future liability.

The proposal would also end, over a period of 10 years, most of the government's responsibilities to manage Indian trust lands and would consolidate ownership of Indian lands, which are now often held by many people.

Interior Secretary Dirk Kempthorne and Attorney General Alberto Gonzales sent the proposal to Dorgan last week, saying they strongly support comprehensive legislation that would help the parties move 'from a litigation-oriented relationship to one of economic prosperity, empowerment and self-reliance for tribes and individual Indians.'

Harper said the proposal is an insult.

'There's no sum specific for how much is going to be used for Cobell\l "l",' he said. 'It's pennies on the dollar.'

He said the plaintiffs estimate the government's liability could exceed $100 billion, though they have in the past considered settling for less.

Cobell\l "l" said the government is trying to do too much at once.

'It's not fair to throw every problem that exists in Indian country that has been created by the Department of Interior into our lawsuit,' she said. 'This lawsuit is about individual Indians and accounting.'

Interior Department spokesman Shane Wolfe said the department looks forward to working with Congress on the proposal. Congress has attempted to wade into the dispute in recent years, but has yet to find resolution.

'We believe this proposal looks to the future,' he said.

END

Advertiser (Australia)

March 8, 2007

Hicks' new U.S. court challenge

STEFANIE BALOGH, NEW YORK

DAVID Hicks is part of a group of Guantanamo Bay detainees attempting to challenge their detention in

the U.S . Supreme Court , in a move that could delay his forthcoming terror trial.

Lawyers for the group of 45 detainees want the U.S . Supreme Court to hear their appeal to end what they see as a legal limbo.

They want to argue that under the Geneva Convention, the terror suspects have Constitutional rights to due process.

They say these have been removed because the detainees have been held for more than five years at the U.S. military base in Cuba. In the petition, lawyers said that what was at stake was ``America's commitment to its core values and the rule of law''.

If the court agrees to hear the case, it could force the suspension of the new U.S. military commission process.

The court will decide at the end of the month whether the case can proceed. Adelaide-born Hicks is the first suspect to go before the new military commission, and is expected to face an arraignment within 30 days.

He was charged last week with providing material support for terrorism. His full trial is due to be held before July.

An Office of Military Commissions spokeswoman said ``at this time the military commissions are proceeding forward''.

Last year, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled the previous U.S. military commissions were unlawful and the Bush Administration was forced to re-draft new rules for the new military commissions.

Hicks' lawyer, Major Michael Mori, had no comment yesterday.

END